

Point-by-point responses to reviewers

Dear reviewers,

Thanks for your hard work in reviewing our manuscript. We read with great caution to all your kind comments and suggestions. Our point-by-point responses are as following:

Reviewer #01438557:

(1) In Fig.1, the word “Unknow” may be wrong. Please confirm.

Response: We have revised the description “Unknow” to “Unknown” in Fig.1. We are so sorry for this mistake.

Reviewer #03004110:

(1) I would only ask to add some comments regarding the use and the role of EUS, since considering the huge time span of the series, only a minority of the cases underwent this evaluation.

Response: Since we have discussed the role of EUS in simple in the Discussion, we decide to add no further comments about the use and the role of EUS. There are already plenty of papers discussing this topic.

In this manuscript, we included only suspected small (≤ 20 mm) gastric GISTs according to EUS characteristics, and other gastric subepithelial lesions suspected as lipoma, cyst, and pancreatic rest, as well as large (more than 20 mm) suspected GISTs were not included. These may be the main causes that limited cases was included during the huge time span. To avoid such misunderstanding, we added the word “small” in the first line of Fig.1.