

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in word format (file name 26547 revised manuscript .doc).

Title: A feasibility study on the expanded indication for endoscopic submucosal dissection of intramucosal poorly differentiated early gastric cancer

Manuscript No: 26547

We have revised the manuscript carefully and all changes are highlighted in the revised version of the manuscript, according to the comments and suggestions of reviewers and editor, and responded, point by point to, the comments as listed below.

I would like to re-submit this revised manuscript to your journal, and hope it is acceptable for publication in the journal.

Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely

Zhibin Huo

Replies to Reviewers and Editor

First of all, we thank both reviewers and editor for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions.

Reviewer #1: This is an interesting study, some English polishing should be revised.

Response: As your suggestion, we have made the manuscript edited by a native English speaker. We sincerely hope that this revised version will meet the language requirements.

Reviewer #2: In this study, the authors identified the clinicopathological factors predictive of LNM in intramucosal poorly differentiated EGC, expanded the

possibility of using ESD for the treatment of intramucosal poorly differentiated EGC. About 81 patients with intramucosal poorly differentiated EGC were included in this study. The authors found that the tumor size, lymphatic vessel involvement and signet-ring-cell component that were significantly associated with LNM by univariate analysis, were found to be significant and independent risk factors for LNM by multivariate analysis. The tumor size, lymphatic vessel involvement and signet-ring-cell component are independently associated with the presence of LNM in intramucosal poorly differentiated EGC. Thus, these three risk factors may be used to set as a simple criterion to expand the possibility of using ESD for the treatment of intramucosal poorly differentiated EGC. Over all, this study is well designed, and the manuscript is well written. Some comments are listed below.

1. The text needed to be edited by a native English speaker. There are some language polishing in the manuscript.

Response: As your suggestion, we have made the manuscript edited by a native English speaker. We sincerely hope that this revised version will meet the language requirements.

2. The results are simple, but interesting. However, if the authors can provide more data or figures, it will be more better.

Response: Thanks for your comments and suggestion. It is a limitation of the study. We have added some words describe the limitations of the study in the discussion section.

3. The references are updated and well discussed.

Response: We accept your suggestion. I have noticed that, and made some changes in the revised version of the manuscript.

4. Please check the data in the tables again.

Response: Thanks for your comments and suggestion. We have checked the data in the tables.