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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The problem remains as to whether this paper is about metachronous MPC or metachronous and synchronous MPC. Redundant descriptions of / comparisons with synchronous MPC still remain and confuse the message. For example in the results the reporting of the sites of MPC is for all with MPC not just those with metachronous MPC. This occurs throughout the results - the authors report findings for all MPC and make comparisons between synchronous and metachronous with the comments about synchronous MPC coming first and therefore appearing more important in the hierarchy of results. The discussion also focuses on synchronous MPC.

In addition I agree with reviewer one - the authors have not discussed why they are concerned about metachronous MPC.

Minor Essential revisions

1. MPC and survival disadvantages - the section about analyzing according to stage of GC have the authors reported survival for all with MPC or just metachronous? - this needs to be clarified, if it is the result for all with MPC explain why as the focus of the report is on metachronous MPC

2. The abbreviations for table one are explained in the authors reply to my initial review they are not in the paper

3. New unexplained abbreviations appear in the methods (EMR/ESD)

4. What is the time period for the mortality rate reported in the results?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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