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**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This study identifies pivotal prognostic factors and introduces a nomogram model for predicting individualized prognosis in GCML. The authors found five independent risk factors including albumin levels, primary tumor size, presence of extrahepatic metastases, surgical treatment status, and chemotherapy administration. This retrospective study is well organized, however, some major issues were raised. 1. The AUC of 0.7-0.8, 0.8-0.9, and 0.9-1.0 indicate fair, good, and excellent predictive accuracies, respectively. The AUC for OSs from 1 to 3 years is fair, so please change the article including the Abstract accordingly. 2. It is unclear which variables were enrolled into the multivariate analysis. Please describe the method in the Statistical analysis. Age and gender should be included in multivariate analysis. There was a significant difference in BMI in univariate analysis, but was it enrolled into multivariate analysis? 3. Since gastric cancer and H. pylori infection status have a clinically important relationship, they should be included in the analysis. Did you assess this relationship?
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for revising. There are still points to be corrected in this manuscript. 1. Age and sex are clinically significant factors for this study. The variables that are enrolled into multivariate analysis must be clinically significant rather than statistically relevant. Therefore, even if age and sex are not significantly associated in univariate analysis, they should be included in multivariate analysis. 2. Although the section on Statistical analysis has been revised, the method for selecting explanatory variables used in multivariate analysis is still not clear. 3. Regarding the relationship with H. pylori, please explain in the limitations why this was not included in the analysis, given that most cases of gastric cancer are infected with H. pylori.