

Dear Editor and Esteemed Reviewers,

I am writing to inform you that I have made revisions to our manuscript based on your valuable recommendations. The following is a list of the changes I have implemented:

Reviewer 1:

- 1-Removed grammatical mistakes from the manuscript.
- 2-Improved the presentation of the table.
- 3-Cite most recent references.
- 4-Provide the proper certified Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate

- 1- Corrected grammatical errors throughout the manuscript.
- 2- Improved the presentation of the table
- 3- Included more recent references to strengthen the literature review.
- 4- The manuscript underwent language editing by a professional language editor, and document is attached

Reviewer 2:

1-One question that the authors need to clarify: Paragraph 4 of the “Results”, what role and significance should be described for the NLR and PLR in the text, and please supplement it in the part of “Discussion

- 1- Condensed the section regarding NLR and PLR in the Results section and expanded the discussion of these parameters in the Discussion section.

Reviewer 3:

- 1) Please state at the beginning of Methods the setting of the study (the hospital where patients were recruited), and provide more details about patients selection: how many metastatic gastric cancer patients were excluded based on the adopted criteria?
- 2) Authors state that overall survival was computed from the date of metastasis; please specify that also the HALP score was determined on the date of metastasis
- 3) Statistical analysis: please provide more details on how the ROC curve analysis was carried out, including the outcome adopted to determine the optimal cutoff value
- 4) In Results, a whole paragraph is devoted to the determination of cut-off values for NLR and PLE, which are not the focus of the study
- 5) Which variables were selected for univariate/multivariate analysis of survival? Variables with significant differences between HALP groups seem not included (comorbidities, ECOG score, tumor grade)

6) The AUC from the ROC analysis (0.64) represents a satisfactory but not very good discriminative ability: please comment in Discussion

- 1- Specified the hospital and clinic where the study was conducted. Provided an explanation of the number of patients excluded from the study based on the exclusion criteria.
- 2- Stated in the Materials and Methods section that the HALP score was calculated based on parameters obtained at the time of metastasis
- 3- How the Roc analysis is done and the results obtained as a result of the analysis are presented in the material and method section and the results section
- 4- Condensed the section regarding NLR and PLR in the Results section and expanded the discussion of these parameters in the Discussion section.
- 5- All parameters with statistically significant difference between HALP groups and which may be of clinical importance were included in the univariate analysis. Clarified in the Materials and Methods section that the multivariate analysis included only parameters that were found to be significant in the univariate analysis
- 6- Provided interpretations of sensitivity, specificity, and AUC obtained from ROC analysis in the limitations paragraph.

I believe that these revisions have significantly improved the quality and clarity of the manuscript. I would like to express my gratitude for your thorough evaluation and constructive feedback, which have immensely contributed to the refinement of our research.

Thank you for considering the revised version of our manuscript. I look forward to receiving your feedback on the updated content. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information or have any additional suggestions.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr. Yakup Duzkopru

Ankara Etlik City Hospital

y_duzkopru@hotmail.com