

Dear Editor and Reviewers:

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript (ID: 68739). We appreciate editor and reviewers very much for their positive and constructive comments on our manuscript. To address the critiques of the reviewers, we revised our manuscript according to their comments. Attached please find the revised version (All changes were underlined), which we would like to submit for your kind consideration. We would like to express our great appreciation to you and reviewers for comments on our manuscript.

Looking forward to hearing from you. Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely

Yingwei Xue

Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, Harbin Medical University Cancer Hospital, Harbin Medical University, Harbin, P. R. China.

E-mail: [xueyingwei@hrbmu.edu.cn](mailto:xueyingwei@hrbmu.edu.cn)

**Reply to Reviewer 1:**

Thank you for taking the time to review and validate our manuscript. Thank you very much for your recognition of our research.

**Reply to Reviewer 2:**

Thank you for giving the suggestions. We have carefully revised according to your opinion, and now the replies are as follows:

1. There is no validation set for the nomogram model.

**Response:** Thank you for your valuable suggestion. Your suggestion is crucial to improving the quality of our research. As you said, the validation set can effectively improve the reliability and clinical applicability of the nomogram model. However, because pT1N2-3 and pT3N0 GC patients are too rare, there is a lack of sufficient sample size for internal validation and external validation of nomogram model, which is also the direction of our further study in the future. We have added this part to the limitation of the manuscript.

2. The language needs to be edited further. For instance, "The AUC of nomogram model in predicting 3-year and 5-year pT3N0 patients prognosis was ..." should be "The AUC of nomogram model in predicting the 3-year and 5-year prognosis of pT3N0 patients was ..."

**Response:** Thank you for your careful review of our manuscript. Improving the quality of the language is very helpful to our articles. We have further polished the language of the manuscript. All changes were underlined.

3. What do you mean by "rererence line" in Figure 4?

**Response:** Thank you for reading our manuscript carefully. This is a mistake caused by a spelling mistake, for which we are very sorry. We have modified "rererence line" to "reference line".

4. In Figure 5, please add the description for the gray and red lines. Besides, the font size in Figure 5 is too small to read.

**Response:** Thank you for your friendly reminder. Appropriate picture annotations and font size can bring a better reading experience for readers. We have add the description for the gray and red lines and enlarge the font size in Figure 5. In addition, we have appropriately enlarged the font size of all the other figures to make them easier to read

5. Please add the unit for CEA and Prealbumin in the text.

**Response:** Thank you for your advice. It is necessary to add units for biomarkers and clinicopathological features in the text, which can make our research more professional. We have add the unit for CEA and Prealbumin in the text. Beyond that, we have added units for other metrics.

We have carefully revised according to your suggestions, thank you again for your review.