

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript, we appreciate editor and reviewers very much for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled “Study on the short-term efficacy and influencing factors of chemotherapy regimen combined with irinotecan in patients with advanced gastric cancer” (#81463). We have fully revised the manuscript according to you and the reviewers’ comments in the revised manuscript and as follows:

We would like to express our great appreciation to you and reviewers for comments on our paper. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you and best regards.

Reviewer 1:

1) Abstract: not good enough and need to add some simple background and be more organized.

Response: Dear reviewer, thanks for your advice. According to your advice, the background has been added to the abstract section. Please check. Thank you very much for your review again.

2) Results: The result of this study is of interest. However, the description of the results section can be more comprehensive, and some important comparative results without statistical significance need to be described.

Response: Dear reviewer, thanks for your advice. According to your advice, the results have been revised with adding some important comparative results without statistical significance. Please check. Thank you very much for your review again.

3) Discussion: The manuscript clearly interprets the finding adequately and appropriately. In addition, the manuscript could highlight the key points clearly. I suggest adding a description of the limitations of this research.

Response: Dear reviewer, thanks for your advice. According to your advice, the limitations of this research have been added to the discussion section. Please check.

Thank you very much for your review again.

4) References: Citations are appropriate and there are many recent new studies, but references [9] and [31-35] did not find corresponding citations in the text.

Response: Dear reviewer, thanks for your advice. According to your advice, these references have been cited in the text. Please check. Thank you very much for your review again.

Reviewer 2:

1) Regarding the Data and Methods section, the information from the baseline period suggests that the results of the SF-36 scale be supplemented, and in addition, it seems clearer to interchange the horizontal and vertical lines of Table 1

Response: Dear reviewer, thanks for your advice. According to your advice, the format of Table 1 has been revised. Please check. Thank you very much for your review again.

2) Regarding the Results section, what is the comparison between the two items referred to in Table 2? It seems to be explained in the remarks; Part 2.5, the difference was not statistically significant ( $z = 0.115$ ,  $P = 0.734 > 0.05$ )... and the difference was not statistically significant ( $z = 0.643$ ,  $P = 0.423 > 0.05$ ). What does  $z = 0.115$  and  $z = 0.643$  mean? Should be  $\chi^2$ ?

Response: Dear reviewer, thanks for your advice. The two items were the comparison of short-term efficacy distribution. The “2” has been changed to “ $\chi^2$ ”. Please check. Thank you very much for your review again.

3) In addition, the “side effect” needs to be modified, generally used as “Adverse event”.

Dear reviewer, thanks for your advice. According to your advice, the “side effect” has been changed to “Adverse event”. Please check. Thank you very much for your review again.

4) All references should be cited in the text. Overall, the manuscript provided a theoretical basis for clinical treatments and could be useful for other studies in this field. I recommend that the manuscript can be published.

Response: Dear reviewer, thanks for your advice. According to your advice, the citations of references have been added. Please check. Thank you very much for your review again.

Reviewer 3:

1) This is an interesting study of the short-term efficacy and influencing factors of chemotherapy combined with irinotecan in patients with advanced gastric cancer. The study is well performed and the manuscript is well written. Only the words in the figures are too small. Please take attention about it. Thank you.

Response: Dear reviewer, thanks for your advice. According to your advice, the words in the figures have been enlarged. Please check. Thank you very much for your review again.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Best regards

Wang Junping