PEER-REVIEW REPORT 1

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors aimed to improve the diagnostic value of blood markers for gastric cancer. The study is well performed. This is an excellent speriemental work conducted with method and scientific rigor. The sample size is big, the inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria are reasonable, and clear. Results are interesting, and well discussed. Some minor spelling mistakes should be checked and corrected, such as, "area uner curve (AUC)" in the Data analysis section, should be "area under curve", "evaluating the abilityof coagulation and fibrinolysis" in the first paragraph of discussion, line 10, the blank betweeen ability and of are missing. Anyway, the manuscript is very well written. After a minor revision, it can be published.

Answer

Thanks for the reviewer comments. The spelling mistakes have been checked and corrected.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT 2

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this article, the authors evaluated the value of multiparameter combined analysis of serum markers in the early diagnosis of gastric cancer. Their data show good diagnostic accuracy especially in early stages of gastric cancer, and provide a new potential method for the early diagnosis of gastric cancer in clinical practice. Some minor points should be addressed:- please edit the structure of table 1. - Figures are too small, please check and update - language needs minor correction.

Answer

We have edit the structure of Table 1. The Figure and language also have been corrected.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT 3

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Excellent study of analysis of the routine blood detection indexes of GC diagnosis. Only the manuscript include the abstract requires a minor editing, both the format and language. Please take attention to some minor spelling mistakes.

Answer

Thanks for the reviewer comments. We have revised the abstract section, and we have also carefully checked the language.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT 4

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The ORCID profiles are not public.
2. Page 7: what does GPC mean?
3. Some minor spelling mistakes; better correct them: - Two misspell words in core tip: "…caner may be provided for clinicl practice. - "Among these indexes, the largest AUC in Ctrls vs GC was and ALB, with values of 0.907" (page 7) - "Abilityof", "repid" – page 9
4. A table with indexes that have significantly different values between Ctrl-GP, Ctrl-GC, as well as Ctrl-GC, would be particularly useful. The value of the cut-off and the percentage for sensitivity and specificity should be included as well.

Answer:

Thanks for the reviewer' comments.

1. The ORCID profiles have been provided in the manuscript.
2. We are very sorry for the GPC wrong spelling. We have revised GPC to GP in the manuscript.

3. We have carefully checked the spelling and language of manuscript, and revised according to the reviewer comments.
4. Thanks for the reviewer' helpful suggestions. Because of the ANN was very complex analyzing method, only the index were input the calculating method, the results were got.