

Dear Reviews & Editors,

Responses to Reviewer 1 (03251591).

Thank you for your feedback about this paper. The increase of tumor marker CA72-4 was a feature of this case that different from other reported cases. So we hope to show it. The original text showed that no specific tumor markers of gastric BCs were found. And we added that the importance of different elevated tumor markers for gastric BCs needs to be further studied. Please see the revised version.

Response to Reviewer 2 (00722963).

Thank you for your review and constructive comments. The radiologist and endoscopist were added to the manuscript as coauthors of this paper, and correspondingly their ORCID numbers and author contributions were also added. But unfortunately we were told that the pathologist have no intention to be a coauthor about the article. Please see the revised version.

Response to Reviewer 3 (02445734).

Thank you for your feedback on this paper.

In addition, we modified some places ourselves.

- All of the revisions that we make to the revised manuscript were highlighted in the updated version of the manuscript by red color.
- Page 2, paragraph 1 – The form of supportive foundation acknowledgment was modified as requirements.
- Page 4, paragraph 3 – The word of “examination” was changed into its plural form as “examinations” .
- Page 6, paragraph 1 – To avoid the 2% similarity index, we re-edited the structure of two sentences.
- The words of “tumour” in the text were uniformly changed to the words of “tumor” .
- All abbreviations were defined again in the correct place.

We hope these will have adequately addressed the concerns and implemented the ideas as suggested.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours Sincerely,

Wenting He, Jingyu Deng, Han Liang, Jianyu Xiao, Fuliang Cao