

Dear Editor and Reviewers of the World Journal of Gastroenterology

Thank you very much for your further consideration and insightful comments on our manuscript "Plexiform angiomyxoid myofibroblastic tumor of the stomach treated by endoscopic submucosal dissection: A case report and review of the literature" (NO: 66196). We appreciate your suggestions, which have greatly optimized the quality of our paper. We hope that the 1st revised version of our manuscript meets your requirements for publication.

The following comprises point-by-point replies to the reviewers' specific comments. Thanks again for your great efforts on our manuscript, thank you!

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The research paper "Plexiform angiomyxoid myofibroblastic tumor of the stomach treated by endoscopic submucosal dissection: A case report and review of the literature" is interesting and brings new insights and surgical techniques. However, there are some objections: 1. Authors have to better describe procedure of endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) as well as postoperative complications and recovery.

Reply: Thanks for your previous wonderful suggestions, which have greatly optimized our manuscript. In the revised version, we described the operation process, the occurrence and treatment of complications, and the final rehabilitation process in detail. Thank again for your efforts.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors presented a rare case of PAMT in a young patient and performed ESD. I think it's acceptable to be published and maybe of interest to the related readers. The language is fluent, and the paper is well organized; therefore, I would love to recommend this report. My only concern: The words may exceed the limits of a "case report", usually within 1000 words is preferred.

Reply: Thanks for your advice on the detail. In order to convey more information to readers, our article not only described a case of PAMT treated by endoscopy, but also summarized the status of this disease. We describe the case-related content and literature review in more detail. It does require a lot of words to describe the patient's entire medical history and related literature review. So, it exceeds the number of words in general cases. Thank you with the utmost sincerity for your suggestion.