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This is a useful overview of the topic and will be of use to the readership of the journal.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors looked back at 130 patients who were treated surgically for gastrointestinal GIST, intending to develop an innovative nomogram to predict recurrence. Major remarks

1) The title is not informative at all. I would suggest changing it to: Development of an innovative nomogram of risk factors to predict postoperative recurrence of gastrointestinal stromal tumors.
2) Bottom of page 4: I would say that the prognosis of GIST "could" be improved. It remains to be seen how (see #5).
3) I have failed to understand the nomogram itself as it has not been directly described in the text. At the bottom of page 8 we read about 9 (?) factors that were calculated using the LASSO model and about 5 other factors. Please provide a clear description of the nomogram and clarify why it is innovative.
4) It should be clarified in the methods whether all the patients had not received any neoadjuvant treatment.
5) The discussion fails to describe how the nomogram could be useful in clinical practice. Can it be used to indicate neoadjuvant treatment and/or exclude patients from surgery with curative intents and/or indicate more stringent follow up?
6) Page 12: In the sentence "Nomograms show that the highest risk of postoperative recurrence is for a tumor in the colorectal area, followed by the small intestine and finally the gastric region" are you referring to the current nomogram? If so, it should be better clarified and the past tense should be used.

Minor remarks
1) Page 5, last but one paragraph: what do you mean by "critical value"?
2) Page 5 last line: the aim should be in the past tense
3) Page 6, Patients: in the third criteria it should be specified "other gastrointestinal malignancy" as GIST are indeed a malignancy.
4) You can add the following reference: Catena F, Di Battista M, Ansaloni L, et al. Microscopic margins of resection influence primary gastrointestinal
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors have improved their manuscript satisfactorily