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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for email about our manuscript, we have read your suggestions carefully and checked the manuscript again, some changes were made.

1. P 2 Abstract

“Conclusion the data from” was replaced by “Conclusion The data from”

2. p. 6 Section 2.1

“Only those patients whose clinical data (include diagnosis, age, sex, address, disease history, etc) were intact and the blocks were enough to be cut into 20 slides were selected, patients from different areas of China were included. One hundred Chinese patients with gastric adenocarcinoma were finally selected in this study. For the small number of patients and specimens with larger tumor size were selected in this study, the significance of this study maybe limited. Because no previous data about Chinese patients, we tried to present our data for reference. If sample size increased, the results would be more representative.” was replaced by

“Only those patients whose clinical data (include diagnosis, age, sex, address, disease history, etc) were intact and the blocks were enough to be cut into 20 slides were selected, and patients from different
areas of China were included. One hundred Chinese patients with
gastric adenocarcinoma were finally selected in this study. As the
sample size is small and specimens with small tumor size (not enough
to make 20 slides) were excluded, the significance of this study may
be limited. Because no previous data from Chinese patients has been
published before, we present our data as a reference. If the sample
size would have been larger, the results would be more representative,
which is a limitation of our study.”

3. p. 11 Section 2.4

“Nineteen comparisons performed, after a Bonferroni adjustment
was made to adjust for multiple comparisons, the difference at P <
0.0026(0.05/19) was considered significant.”

was replaced by “Nineteen comparisons were performed, after a
Bonferroni adjustment was made to adjust for multiple comparisons,
and the difference at P < 0.0026(0.05/19) was considered
significant.”

4. P. 26

The text in “Legend to Figures” was double-spaced.

5. P. 26

“Figure 1 A: Case 10, Immunohistochemistry showed EGFR positive(3+)
in gastric adenocarcinoma,” was replaced by “Figure 1 A: Case
10, immunohistochemistry showed EGFR positive(3+) in gastric
adenocarcinoma,”

“Figure 2 A: Case36, Immunohistochemistry showed HER2 2+ in gastric adenocarcinoma,” was replaced by “Figure 2 A: Case36, immunohistochemistry showed HER2 2+ in gastric adenocarcinoma,”