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Reviewer's report:

General Comments

In general I am satisfied with the statistical analyses in this paper. I do have some questions and comments related to clarity of communication.

Major Compulsory Revision

1. Abstract. Results, page 3. Of what value are paired correlations between age, Borrmann type, etc and peritoneal dissemination when those factors may be interrelated? Why not simply present results from the Cox regression so you can comment on the impact of one factor after taking into account the other factors?

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Throughout the paper. Percentages can be rounded to the nearest integer. Is 0.1% all that important?

2. Abstract. Results, page 3, 4 lines from bottom. INF, Morrmann type, and TNM node stage were correlated with what?

3. Methods, page 7, line 5. Why report mean follow-up for a skewed distribution? Mean follow-up is not meaningful. Median and range are sufficient.

4. Figure Legends. The Figure Legends are mislabeled. My copy of the manuscript had duplicate copies of Figures 4-6.

5. P values, throughout the manuscript. P values greater than 0.01 can be rounded to 2 decimal places. Anything more is artificial precision.

6. Tables 2 and 4. Why include the actual coefficients, SE, and Wald values? The hazard ratios, P values, and conf intervals are sufficient.

7. Table 3. A SD is reported better as 59.6 (SD 9.9). The +/- is superfluous since a SD is a single positive number.
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