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Reviewer's report:

The Authors should be complimented for a simple and correct study. The topic is of interest and may have clinical consequences. I've got some remarks: 1) the Japanese guidelines do not suggest D2 dissection for EGC, as stated by the Authors; 2) the overall workload of gastric cancer cases by this Centre should be specified, as well as the rate of advanced versus early cancers; 3) many compliments for very good results in term of mortality (around 2%, less than one third with respect to recent national surveys in Europe), and R0 (100%); in my mind, 100% R0 is surprising (any distal or proximal resection margin involved?? this is somewhat different from the real life practice); 4) I wonder if 28% of patients with less than 15 harvested nodes should be included in this study; theoretically they are Nx if no metastatic nodes weren't reported. The Authors should discuss and explain their choice; a paper from our Group analyzing this problem in N0 gastric cancer patients discusses this topic, and may be helpful to the Authors (Ann Surg 2010, see also Letter to the Editor 2011); 5) in the references, the paper of Roviello and Coll is listed 2 times
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