

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer's code: 00068458

We are very grateful to the peer reviewer for his precious time and advice. We have meticulously considered each and every comment of the reviewer and where possible, have implemented the changes to bring about a better manuscript.

1. In "Introduction" section, gastric cancer is one of most common cancers in the world, with 1,000,000 new cases diagnosed in 2012. The authors should correct the 100 new million cases to about 1 million new cases.

Response: We sincerely apologize for this typing mistake on our behalf, It is indeed 1 million new cases. We have made the appropriate changes in the revised edition.

2. Gene names in the manuscript must be italic.

Response: We have carefully made the appropriate changes as per the requirements.

3. In page 7, 2nd paragraph, 2nd line, the "makers" must be "marker".

Response: Thank you. We have revised and proofread the whole manuscript to avoid typing mistakes.

4. In page 11, 2nd paragraph, the similar and specific alterations found in DNA from both tumor tissue and cfDNA..... These tumor-specific changes of cfDNA included changes in size, oncogene and tumor suppressor gene mutations, microsatellite alterations and hyper-methylation of several genes. What is the meaning of the size?

Response: The size was referring to the changes in the molecular size of the tumor DNA but we rephrased the sentence to avoid any confusion.

Lines 314-315 "The similar and specific alterations found in DNA from both the tumor tissue and cfDNA proved the tumoral origin of the cfDNA in cancer patients. These tumor-specific changes of cfDNA included changes in molecular size, oncogene and tumor suppressor gene mutations, microsatellite alterations and hyper-methylation of several genes."

Reviewer's code: 03017864

1) In the introduction authors may consider citing and discussing the previously published review articles on the same topic. For instance, review by Jayavelu et al. "Metabolomic studies of human gastric cancer: review" etc.

Response: We are very grateful for this kind suggestion. We have laid our focus on recent advances based on the proteomics. The work by Jayavelu et al. is indeed very praiseworthy and we indeed to include their study in our future work.

2) It is a good practise to provide full forms rather only abbreviations. For instance, see page 5 "proteomic techniques, such as SELDI and HCLP,

Response: It has been an honest mistake on our behalf to have forgotten to include the full forms of the technical terms. We have already made the appropriate amendments in the revised manuscript.

3) It may be a good idea to present the identified biomarkers in the Table format to provide the readers a quick view.

Response: We value the suggestion by the reviewer and we have listed out the main biomarkers that have been in the limelight of GC research and prove to be very pragmatic tools in the diagnosis and clinical management of GC. We have given concise notes about those biomarkers and listed the corresponding Ref. in a supplementary table.

4) A figure would be beneficial to the readers from other fields, briefly explaining the principles behind the serum proteomics to identify the biomarkers for gastric cancer.

Response: It is indeed a very good suggestion but however, since proteomics is a field of upcoming techniques and complicated methodologies, we hereby find ourselves unable to find a way to represent the various techniques graphically. We however have labelled the corresponding references whereby the main mechanism behind each and every technique has been very well described and illustrated.