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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article is well organized and written. 1. There are several errors of spacing of the words and mispelling. (epitheloid, charcteristics, verylow, SUV.Liver, atleast) 2. I can't understand this sentence; They concluded that LWR can be safely performed and they have better outcome in terms of postoperative recovery regardless of tumor size and location [54]. You mean in terms of?
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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This paper reviewed the GIST from its pathogenesis to diagnosis and management. The paper is well organized and written. But it is necessary to present pathogenesis clearly through some figures. And some spacing errors need to be evaded.
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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is a review article about GIST management. I think it is a well written paper but there are some spacing errors in sentences.