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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   yes
3. Are the data sound?
   yes, taking into account the discussed limitations of the study.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   yes.
   However I miss a discussion
   1) of the clinical consequences of the data: is there any relevance of digital image analysis for the decision to operate (or to biopsy) a respective mesenchymal gastric tumor?
   2) are there data on any other noninvasive diagnostic tools to characterize mesenchymal gastric tumors (elastography, contrast enhanced EUS)?

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   yes, however the problem of selection was only touched.
   I propose to add data on how many gastric subepithelial tumors have been examined in the respective time period of the study. Which gastric subepithelial tumors have not been operated on in this time period, and which criteria were used to decide on operation? The authors only mention in their discussion, that patients were selected for surgery according to the clinical opinions and decisions of the medical doctors.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
yes
9. Is the writing acceptable?
yes

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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