Dear Editor and Reviewers:

First of all, I would like to thank the reviewers for their very positive comments on my manuscript. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as flowing:

Response to review's comment:

1. The manuscript was well-organized.

Response: This is the reviewer's praise for the content of my article. I need to say "thank you" again.

2. Although authors mentioned that their study lacked experimental evidence for a direct mechanism (page 23, discussion), I strongly suggest authors try to survey the potent mechanisms or hypothesis from papers and summarize the possible mechanisms to interpret the effect of NALT1 on GC malignant phenotype through regulating NOTCH1 expression at the transcriptional level.

Response: Thank you very much for your comments! I think our experimental design coincides with that of the reviewer. We proposed a regulation mechanism between NALT1 and NOTCH1. And this was based on the hypothesis of where they were in the genome. This was also an assumption based on existing theories, as I mentioned in references 20 and 21. This regulation between genes occurs at the transcriptional level. In the

future study, we will further study the specific binding sites of the two.

Response to editor:

The pictures in my article are combined by AI software instead of PPT.

Therefore, I can not upload. PPT format file. However, I can send my AI

file to you via email. They are also decomposable.

I will send an email to this mailbox: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com.

Thank you!