PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study included 48 patients with advanced gastric cancer. Mainly studies the correlation between liver metastasis and the effect of immunotherapy. The results of the study found that patients with liver metastases have poorer immunotherapy effects. This provides a reference for clinical treatment. It also provides directions for clinical research. There are several comments: 1. The language needs polishing. For example: "Prediction of patient's outcome Based on the 2023 worldwide cancer epidemiology figures" 2. What content is expressed in Table1 and Table2 respectively, please explain in detail in the manuscript. 3. Specific treatment options for each patient should be presented. 4. It is recommended to use low, medium and high to distinguish tissue differentiation types. 5. Have these patients been tested for MSI/TMB?