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The paper address to an important topic because early gastric cancer is not so frequent in the Western countries, particularly in East Europe. Thus, the paper would be of interest for the readers. However, some important concerns should be raised:

Please define traditional and conventional gastrectomy. The terms are not very clear.

How the patients were selected for D1 or D2 gastrectomy? Was any difference of lymph nodes count between the two types of lymph nodes dissection? If so, do the authors consider that this difference might affect the odds to find positive lymph nodes?

The authors said that "Depending on cancer localization in the stomach and differentiation grade, the type of surgery - total or subtotal gastrectomy- was usually determined before operation". Please be more specific. For example almost 50% of the patients were G3. How the G3 did influenced the choice of the type of gastrectomy?

The overall survival time was calculated probably not only to the death of patient but also to a certain date for the living patients. Please provide the date of the last follow-up for the living patients. How did the authors know if the cause of death was related or not to the gastric cancer?

Eliminate the redundant text - remove the information that is already shown in Tables. The text referring to morbidity and mortality should be more comprehensive. Please just enumerate the causes of postoperative mortality without showing percentages like 25% etc.

How do the authors explain the fact that a D2 gastrectomy was a negative prognostic factor for the long-term survival in the present study? This is in contradiction with the largest part of the recent studies that showed the clear benefit of a D2 gastectomy over a D1 gastrectomy. Why do the authors use a D2 gastrectomy instead of a D1 gastrectomy if there is a negative impact? To me this is a major concern.

Please discuss how the results of the present study should be used in the clinical decision.

The manuscript should be checked by a Native English.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal