

I have updated the manuscript using all of the recommendation from the first reviewer, except for their 2nd request which stated "To enhance the readers' interest, the authors may provide a set of typical figures of a large GIST receiving laparoscopic resection, such as CT, histology, gross and microscopic histology." I do not believe this would add to the article, but if you and the reviewers feel strongly, I certainly can try to get those images. However, I did add an additional section on the diagnosis of GISTs, as requested.

I do not believe that the table the 2nd reviewer wanted would add to the study. I have been reviewing the studies and they are quite disparate in their methodology and reporting of information. Some are lap only, some case-matched w/ open case, some single center reports of experience, so the data provided is not consistent throughout the studies. All studies have information such as mean/median size, tumor free margin, and a list of complications, but when it comes to demographics some do not differentiate between lap and open cases (as that was not the main point of the study). Additionally, the list of complications are quite disparate between the studies with each study reporting <10 complications and over 15 different complications ranging from UTI, urinary retention, pulmonary complication, pneumonia, fever of unknown origin, fever due to atelectasis, afib, cardiac arrest, MI, stroke, DVT, axillary thrombosis, wound infection, etc. In short, I do not believe this will add to the manuscript (which is why a comprehensive table of this sort was not added in the original iteration.) Again, if you and the reviewers believe this is required, I will do my best to put something together.