Comments to the Authors,

This manuscript studied the association between COG-PS statuses and *LINE-1* methylation in a large population of Korea colon cancer patients. Meanwhile, the study provided the evolution of the sole and combined prognostic value of the *LINE-1* methylation and COG-PS statuses. The study was performed rigorously and the findings are interesting. However, I have several concerns as the following:

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1, The effectiveness or the representativeness of the primers for LINE-1 and STR should be discussed carefully. What’s the variance of the applied method? Why only use two CpG sites to represent LINE-1 methylation status? Why only use five STR markers?

2, The association between LINE-1 methylation and microsatellite status should be provided in the result section.

4, 95%CI should be followed by OR rather than P-value. In addition, the exact numbers of the sample size for each situation should be provided in the Table 2.

5, Abbreviation of TNR in Line 38 page 7, LN in line1 page 8, should be provided since it was firstly used in the manuscript. Please check the manuscript again.

6, OR should be provided in the Table 1.

7, The information of the detection to the mutation (line 33 page 10) should be provided in the method section.

8, The Figure 1 and Figure 2 are too crude, the value of the number are vague.