

Dear editor,

Thanks a lot for your consideration of our article (no. 87227) for publication in your journal. We have revised our paper as the advices of the reviews. The questions we replied are as following:

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** It was privilege for me to read your manuscript. I find these kind of studies very important in order to enhance therapeutic options for aggressive cancers such as gastric cancer. However, I don't think I have enough knowledge and expertise for criticizing your article and I will ask the editor to assign another reviewer instead of me.

Answer: Thank you very much for your recognition of our research. We hope to get more suggestions from you in the future research.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** I regard to the manuscript "Constructing a gastric cancer prognostic model based on the sub-group analysis of the disulfidptosis related genes, exploring treatment targets and sensitive drugs", I have read it and think that this is an interesting work and can be considered for publications. In these days, efficient protocols for cancer prognosis are extremely needed. Nevertheless, the manuscript contains some errors in English and also it would require some accurately revision. If the authors can address the related issues in the manuscript, then it can be reconsidered for the press, in my opinion 1. The relevance of the work should be highlighted in the last paragraph of introduction 2. The introduction must be broadened. it is necessary to complementing with previous studies in disulfidptosis in GC. 3. Provide more information about the model validation 4. Please add the error bars at all graphics 5. The conclusions appear more like a summary of the study. In this part, it is expected that the authors would synthesize all the findings and draw conclusions vis-a-vis their implications. What are the major implications of the study findings on the practical applications? Etc

Answer: Thank you very much, your revisions and suggestions to this article are very professional and organized. We have made further additions to the introduction. Regarding the research on double warps, we find that there are few studies in this area at present. If there is too much information about model validation, we can provide it in the supplementary documentation. We added error lines to the possible graphs. As for the conclusion, we have made further revisions and supplements. It is marked with a yellow background.