

APR. 3th, 2016

Dear Managing editor:

RE: "**Recent updates of precision therapy for gastric cancer: towards optimal tailored management**"

Coauthored by **Moon Kyung Joo, Jong-Jae Park, Hoon Jai Chun**

Thank you very much for giving us an opportunity for revision.

Both sets of comments by the reviewers have proved useful in rewriting this manuscript. We revised this manuscript according to reviewers' comments point by point. We hope that these changes following the reviewers' specific suggestions provide improved quality of manuscript and make this paper more suitable for publication. In our response paragraph, we stressed the changes in the revised manuscript as changing the font to **BOLD**.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Moon Kyung Joo, M.D., Ph.D.

Jong-Jae Park, M.D., Ph.D.

Hoon Jai Chun, M.D., Ph.D.

Revision point by point

Reviewer: 1

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reviewed “recent updates of precision therapy for gastric cancer: towards optimal tailored management”. This is a current topic of interest, and is summarized right to the point.

Minor revision

1. (P12 L11) RILOMET-2 study has been terminated since the result of RILOMET-1 was reported. (according to “ClinicalTrials.gov”)

Response) Thank you for your kind pointing out. Accepting your suggestion, we corrected the sentence in P12 L11 as follows:

Thus, the phase III RILOMET-2 study has been ~~initiated~~ **performed** to investigate the efficacy of rilotumumab....

We also deleted the contents of RILOMET-2 study in table 2 which summarized the ongoing studies.

2. (P15L14) Dose “heptatoceullar” mean “hepatocellular” ?

3. (P19L3) “regorefenib” should be replaced as “regorafenib”.

4. (P45, Table 1) In the line of PRODIGE17 trial, the unit of 4 mos PFS rate would be % instead of mos.

Response) Thank you for your kind correction. We corrected the above misspelling in the revised manuscript.

5. (P45, Table 1) The outcomes had better be lined up in order. Authors report OS, PFS and ORR at first lines but at last ORR, PFS and OS in the same table.

Response) The priority of OS, PFS and RR in table 1 was ordered according to the primary and secondary end point of each study. For example, if OS is in the first place, that means that OS was the primary end point and RR and PFS were secondary outcomes. If ORR was in the first place, ORR was the primary end point of that study. Anyway, we accepted your suggestion, and unified in order of “OS, PFS, (O)RR”.

6. (P46, Table 1, Note) leukovorin should be rewritten as leucovorin.

Response) Thank you for your kind correction. We corrected the above misspelling in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer: 2

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article is an interest and a much debated topic. Authors must be complimented for their study. The manuscript is very interesting. Before final acceptance for publication there are a few points that should be implemented in the abstract and introduction sections: ? The aim and the type of the study should be clearly stated.

Response) We agree with your opinion. By accepting your suggestion, we added the following sentence in the end of the abstract as follow:

~~The collective data are pointing the way to efficacious precision therapy of gastric cancer.~~ **In this topic highlight, we reviewed biologic roles and outcomes clinical studies targeting above mentioned signaling pathways.**

Also, we corrected and added several words in the last paragraph in introduction to clarify the aim of the study as follow:

In this topic highlights, we **summarize aimed to review the biologic roles of** several molecular signaling pathways on the basis of recent trials of targeted therapies in advanced gastric cancer.