PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The incidence of gastric cancer has been very high. In this study, the authors compared the results of oral contrast-enhanced ultrasonography and gastroscopy with those of postoperative pathology to assess the diagnostic value of oral contrast-enhanced ultrasonography for gastric tumors. They found that oral contrast-enhanced ultrasonography has relatively high accuracy for TNM staging of gastric tumors, which could complement electronic gastroscopy, and provide more reliable evidence for the selection of treatment strategies and evaluation of outcomes for patients with gastric tumors. The study is very well designed and the manuscript is very well written. The results are reasonable, and well discussed. Minor comments: 1. The manuscript requires a minor language editing. Some minor language polishing should be corrected. 2. The tables and figures require to be re-arranged. 3. Please add the limitations of this study to the discussion section by retrospectively analyzing the results and conclusions of 42 patients with gastric tumors.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read this manuscript with great interesting. The study is well performed. Chuanyu Wang et al. explored the diagnostic value of oral contrast-enhanced ultrasonography for gastric tumors. They compared the oral contrast-enhanced ultrasonography and electronic gastroscopy with the postoperative pathological findings, which is the gold standard, in the diagnosis of 42 patients with gastric tumors. The findings in this study are interesting. However, I am confused about some of the results in the article: 1. The authors mention that "Oral contrast-enhanced ultrasonography diagnosed gastric cancer in 40 patients (Figure 1), stromaltumor in two patients (Figure 2), and leiomyosarcoma in two patients. "But the sample size studied was 42 cases, here 40 gastric cancer patients, 2 stromaltumor patients and 2 leiomyosarcoma patients, A total of 44 patients, exceeded the overall sample size. 2. I note that 42 patients with gastric tumors did not undergo TNM staging, so how to calculate the coincidence rate (accuracy) of TNM staging of T1, T2, T3, T4 gastric cancer? other than that, the manuscript is well written and professionally presented. Authors made a detailed an informative discussion of the results.