

Response to reviewers and editors

We really appreciate the effort that reviewers and editor made on our manuscript “Protective Effects of Female Reproductive Factors on Gastric Signet-ring Cell Carcinoma” (Manuscript ID: 71485), especially you share your valuable feedback on our work. We have read the comments carefully and provided our responses accordingly. For your convenience, all changes in the revised submission have been highlighted by yellow. Attached are our point-to-point responses to the Reviewers’ comments.

Comments from reviewers

Reviewer 1:

1. The manuscript requires a minor editing. Some minor language polishing should be corrected.

Thank you for your comments. We have corrected grammar errors and improved certain sentences. Please refer to the highlight language in yellow.

2. The images of Figure 2 and Figure 3 are too small, please update the images.

We feel very grateful for your constructive suggestions. We have provided the original figure documents using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

3. The tables are good, however, require an editing.

Thank you for your suggestion. We have tried to improve the tables accordingly. I am appreciated that you gave us chance to revise our

manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

1. The topic is very important and the analysis was very sound. However, I would like to suggest the authors to address as a future research topic to conduct machine learning analysis and compare its results to its Cox counterparts.

Thank you for your comments.

We agree that it is a research direction that we conduct machine learning analysis and compare its results to its Cox counterparts; however, investigating the machine learning analysis method is not the theme of this research. Our future research will consider this idea. It is our sincere hope that this work provides the evidence and inspiration to guide sex-specific treatment strategy and prognosis for gastric cancer patients with signet ring cells proportion. Thank you again.

Science editor:

1. In this interesting study, the authors analyzed clinicopathological differences between sex groups to reveal sex disparities in gastric signet-ring cell carcinoma. The study is very well designed. The results are reasonable, and well discussed. Some minor editing is required.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

We appreciate the reviewer's positive evaluation of our work. We have proofread the text twice and correct grammar errors.

Company editor-in-chief:

1. I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please provide the original figure documents.

Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Thank you for your thorough summary and reminder. We have modified the figures in Powerpoint accordingly and have uploaded "Approved Grant Application Form(s) or Funding Agency Copy of any Approval Document(s)". Besides, we revised the references according to Format for References Guidelines using the reference auto-analyser. We also check abbreviations in our manuscript, tables and figures refer to basic rules.