Dear editors and reviewers:

Thanks for your kind help. The reviewers gave us many useful suggestions and comments for our article, and we have revised one by one accordingly. In the revised manuscript, the important revision was that that we updated the mesh terms and corrected the flow chart of the study, and a table of the study based on helpful comments from the reviewers. All revision were shown in "<mark>yellow</mark>".

We hope that the revised article could be better understanding and more rigorous. Thanks again for the help of all the editors and reviewers. Here are our answers.

Reviewer #1:

Q1: Dear Authors, The topic focuses on the scientific community reported in clinical trials, so a review article is essential. In the context of a review-type article, the authors should deeply revise the structure of the present work; namely, the mesh terms in the search strategy, e.g., tooth decay, are not mesh terms. The PRISMA question, a flow chart of the studies, and a table of the selected studies should be presented for a better understanding. As a new topic, epidemiological data will focus the leaders on updated findings. For the above reasons, I suggest rewriting the manuscript and resubmitting it.

Q1: In the context of a review-type article, the authors should deeply revise the structure of the present work; namely, the mesh terms in the search strategy, e.g., tooth decay, are not mesh terms.

A1: Thank you for your recognition of our work and your valuable suggestion. We searched by mesh and redefined the search terms to make sure that our search terms were mesh terms, such as dental caries and Full teeth. (Line 79) After researching, we found 3 more articles. According to the Inclusion and exclusion criteria, there was no more study included.

Q2: The PRISMA question, a flow chart of the studies, and a table of the selected studies should be presented for a better understanding.

A2: Thank you for your recognition of our work and your valuable suggestion. We have presented a flow chart of the studies, and a table of the selected studies. We supplied the PRISMA.

Q3: As a new topic, epidemiological data will focus the leaders on updated findings.

A3: Thank you for your recognition of our work and your valuable suggestion. Your suggestion was helpful for us. We queried the most recent studies and revised our epidemiological data. (Line 47)

Reviewer #2:

Q1: The authors demonstrated the close relationship between poor oral health and high risk of gastric cancer in this study. Although this study has the clinical importance, there is one comment. Comment 1. In the present study, tooth brushing had no influence on the risk of gastric cancer. How do the authors discuss about this result?

A1: Thank you for your recognition of our work and your valuable suggestion. Tooth brushing could also affect your oral health, however, we didn't find the association between tooth brushing and GC. Shakeri R et al. discussed the relationship between tooth brushing frequency and GC rates in their study. They found that those who never brushed their teeth had significantly higher rates of GC, while those who brushed their teeth every day or less than daily had no significant change in their rates of GC. In our study, we only explored the effect of whether or not teeth were brushed on the incidence of GC. This might have contributed to our results. (Line 203-210)

Science editor:

1 Conflict of interest statement: Academic Editor has no conflict of interest. 2 Academic misconduct: No academic misconduct was found. 3 Scientific quality: The authors submitted a study of poor oral health was associated with higher risk of gastric cancer. The manuscript is overall qualified.

Answer: Thank you for your comments on our article. Your comments have been very informative and helpful in revising the article! We have made changes accordingly, and all revisions are shown in "==yellow==".

(1) Advantages and disadvantages: The reviewers have given positive peer-review reports for the manuscript. Classification: Grade C and Grade D; Language Quality: Grade A and Grade A. The author confirmed a close relationship between poor oral health and high risk of cancer in this study. Although this study has the clinical importance, there is one comment. In the present study, tooth brushing had no influence on the risk of gastric cancer. How do the authors discuss about this result? In the context of a review-type article, the authors should deeply revise the structure of the present work; namely, the mesh terms in the search strategy. As a new topic, epidemiological data will focus the leaders on updated findings.

Answer: Thanks for the affirmation and the advice. Tooth brushing could also affect your oral health, however, we didn't find the association between tooth brushing and GC. Shakeri R et al. discussed the relationship between tooth brushing frequency and GC rates in their study. They found that those who never brushed their teeth had significantly higher rates of GC, while those who brushed their teeth every day or less than daily had no significant change in their rates of GC. In our study, we only explored the effect of whether or not teeth were brushed on the incidence of GC. This might have contributed to our results. (Line 203-210) Moreover, we searched by mesh and redefined the search terms to make sure that our search terms were mesh terms, such as dental caries and Full teeth. (Line 79) The studies we included in our study contained the most recent research, so we believed we discussed the most

recent findings.

(2) Main manuscript content: The author clearly stated the purpose of the study and the research structure is complete. However, the manuscript is still required a further revision according to the detailed comments listed below.

Answer: Thanks for your kind help and valuable suggestion. Your comments have been very informative and helpful in revising the article! We have made changes accordingly, and all revisions are shown in "<mark>yellow</mark>".

(3) Table(s) and figure(s): There are 4 Figures and 4 Tables should be improved. Detailed suggestions for each are listed in the specific comments section.

Answer: Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have revised figures and tables as per your suggestion. these revised figures and tables were resubmitted.

(4) References: A total of 43 references are cited, including 10 published in the last 3 years.

Answer: Thank you for your recognition of our work and your valuable suggestion. We have updated our cited studies to the maximum extent possible. The updated references include Ref. 3, 11-13, 18-19, 35-36, 40-42.

4 Language evaluation: The English-language grammatical presentation needs to be improved to a certain extent. There are many errors in grammar and format, throughout the entire manuscript. Before final acceptance, the authors must provide the English Language Certificate issued by a professional English language editing company. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240.

Answer: Thank you for your recognition of our work and your valuable

suggestion. We asked a team of professionals to help us modify. All language revision were shown in red and the certification will be submitted as "Editing Certificate". Thanks again for your advice.

5 Specific comments: (1) Please provide the Figures cited in the original manuscript in the form of PPT. All text can be edited, including A,B, arrows, etc. With respect to the reference to the Figure, please verify if it is an original image created for the manuscript, if not, please provide the source of the picture and the proof that the Figure has been authorized by the previous publisher or copyright owner to allow it to be redistributed. All legends are incorrectly formatted and require a general title and explanation for each figure. Such as Figure 1 title. A: ; B: ; C: .

Answer: Thanks for your kind help. We have prepared a PPT in accordance with the requirements, which will be submitted. All figures are original to us, no conflict of interest involved. Meanwhile, We have also revised figure legends as requested.

(2) Please obtain permission for the use of picture(s). If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published, and correctly indicate the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World J Gastroenterol 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source

in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable.

Answer: Thanks for the heads up. All figures are original to us, no conflict of interest involved. So we don't need to get any permission.

(3) Please don't include any *, #, †, §, ‡, ¥, @....in your manuscript; Please use superscript numbers for illustration; and for statistical significance, please use superscript letters. Statistical significance is expressed as aP <0.05, bP <0.01 (P > 0.05 usually does not need to be denoted). If there are other series of P values, cP <0.05 and dP <0.01 are used, and a third series of P values is expressed as eP <0.05 and fP <0.01.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestion. We have deleted some symbols and indicated them with numerical superscripts. However, the @ symbol appeared in the corresponding author's mailbox, which could not be removed. We have added letter superscripts to statistically significant P values.

(4) Please add the Core tip section. The number of words should be controlled between 50-100 words.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestion. The aim of this current study was to assess whether there was a relationship between oral health and the risk of gastric cancer. A total of 1,431,677 patients from twelve included studies were enrolled for data analysis in this study. This article summarised all the papers over the years on the relationship between oral health and the incidence of gastric cancer. After analysing them, the existing controversies were resolved to some extent. It was useful to guide clinical work.

(5) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text (and directly before the References).

Answer: Thanks for your suggestion. We've added article highlights in the appropriate sections. This article summarised all the papers over the years on the relationship between oral health and the incidence of gastric cancer. After analysing them, the existing controversies were resolved to some extent. It was useful to guide clinical work. (Line 223-226)

(6) Please provide the Biostatistics statement.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestion. We have statisticians who do statistics, our team has published many articles and had rich statistical experience. So, we did not need to get the Biostatistics Review Certificate.

(7) Please provide the Institutional review board statement.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestion. Institutional Review Board statement was submitted.

(8) Please provide the Informed consent statement.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestion. Informed consent statement was submitted.

(9) Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. If there is no PMID or DOI, please provide the website address.

Answer: Thank you for your advice. We have revised the formatting of all cited documents as requested. All revisions were marked in ==yellow== in the manuscript.

(10) Please provide the Clinical trial registration statement.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestion. This study is not a clinical trial. It is a retrospective observational study. Therefore, we do not need clinical trial registration statement.

Thanks for your kind help. According to your suggestions, we have revised one by one accordingly. We hope that the revised article is more attractive and clearly reading.