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Dear Editor,
Thank you very much for your letter and advice. We have revised the paper, and would like to re-submit it for your consideration. We have addressed the comments raised by the reviewers, and the amendments are highlighted in red in the revised manuscript. We hope that the revision is acceptable, and we look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Ke Chen, M.D.
Department of General Surgery,
Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital,
School of Medicine, Zhejiang University,
No. 3 East Qingchun Road, Hangzhou 310016,
Zhejiang Province, China.

chenke0301243@163.com
We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the reviewers for their constructive and positive comments.

Major Compulsory Revisions

In this manuscript, the authors reported laparoscopic versus open wedge resection for gastrointestinal stromal tumors of the stomach: a single-center 8-year retrospective cohort study of 156 patients with long-term follow-up. This article is interesting, but it has some points that require further attention as described below.

1) Table 1: hematocrit#hemoglobin

   Answer: we have corrected this mistakes in the revised paper.

2) The tumor size in the LWR group was smaller than that in the OWR group. The follow-up period in the LWR group was shorter than that of in the OWR. However, the selection criteria was not described in this manuscript. The authors should clarify the selection criteria in the manuscript.

   Answer: When we introduced the LWR previously, only a few patients were willing to underwent this novel medical procedure. After we have grasped the technique of LWR, the proportion of LWR proportion gradually increase and the proportion of OWR proportion gradually reduced. Therefore, the follow-up time of LWR cases is shorter than OWR.

3) Letters of all figures were somewhat blurry. The authors should make clear figure images.

   Answer: we have made some adjustment in the revised paper.

4) Sample sizes are not so large. The authors may use non-parametrical statistical methods (e.g. Mann-Whitney U test) instead of Student’s t test. A consultation with the statistician may be need.

   Answer: Student's t-tests are usually used based on two key points, 1. each of the two populations being compared should follow a normal distribution, 2. The variances of the two compared populations should be equal. We use Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to assesses the normal distribution of two population and F-test to assesses the equality of variances of the two compared populations. Above all, we believe Student's t-tests is suitable in this study.

5) Needs some language corrections before being published

   Answer: the revised paper has been polished by a native speaker.