

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Rejection

Specific Comments to Authors: When I was invited for manuscript title Clinicopathological Characteristics and Prognosis of Gastric Signet Ring Cell Carcinoma review, I liked it because gastric cancer is my specialty. But in this case the authors don't show us news, just more of the same and the obvious.

Respond:

First, the data for this study are obtained from the SEER database (5,200 cases) and the Second Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University (603 cases). Our findings are validated by our own external data, and not all data from public databases.

Secondly, it is undeniable that many similar studies exist on the clinicopathological features and prognosis of gastric indolent cell carcinoma, but the present study has a larger sample size and includes both eastern and western populations. The results of this study also differ from previous studies and are more comprehensive in terms of pathological features, survival prognosis and treatment options, etc. The Kwon, KJ. et al (PMID: 23389081) study, with a sample of 769 cases, showed that the clinicopathological features of GSRC were similar to those of the undifferentiated type and that in EGC, the prognosis of GSRC was not significantly different from that of non-GSRC. This differs from our findings and differs from the Bamboat, ZM, et al, Chon, HJ, et al. The Bamboat, ZM, et al (PMID: 24394986) study had 569 samples and this study only analysed the prognosis of GSRC. The Chon, HJ, et al (PMID: 27232252) study although it included a sample of 7667 cases, the study did not analyse the risk factors affecting the survival prognosis of GSRC, or the treatment of GSRC. Therefore, I believe that this study is relevant and will help us to better understand GSRC and guide clinical management.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: No special comments.

Respond:

Thank you very much for your support.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade E (Do not publish)

Language Quality: Grade D (Rejection)

Conclusion: Rejection

Specific Comments to Authors: Dear Author(s), The article comes from surgery department. Main issue to discuss should be D1, D2 dissection and effects on survival. Radiotherapy does not work (CLASSIC, ARTIST II trials) and should be in discussion section. Why 5 year survival is Article

design quality and context of text is weak.

Respond:

I have great respect for the reviewers' comments. The main focus of this study is to examine the clinicopathological features and survival prognosis of GSRC and does not involve a specific surgical approach. Previous studies have shown that GSRC is resistant to radiotherapy and this study is discussed in detail in the Discussion section, paragraph 5. In addition, the follow-up period for the external validation group in this study was only 3 years.

Reviewer #4:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: In this article, it compared the pathological features of GSRC with those of gastric adenocarcinoma of different degrees of differentiation and the differences in survival prognosis between the different disease processes. The conclusion is clear: the prognosis of SRC should be accurately analyzed according to stage adjustment. SRC patients can benefit from early detection, surgical resection, and aggressive adjuvant therapy. 1. This study is innovative. 2. The research design is reasonable and rigorous, with clear ideas and clear conclusions. 3. With the help of language editing, the language expression of the paper is good. 4. The description of the conclusion is slightly redundant.

Respond:

Thank you very much for your support. We have further streamlined the conclusion section.