Peer Review File

Article Information: https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jgo-23-259

Reviewer A

This study deserves publication, however in the discussion the authors need to include a paragraph describing the association of gastric cancer in young patients with heredity and the main genetic mutations.

Reply: We have already added the description of the association of gastric cancer in young patients with hereditary and main genetic mutations in Discussion section.

Changes in the text: Page 9, line 230 – 237; and Page 11, line 290.

Reviewer B

This is an interesting manuscript highlighting a very interesting and timely topic. As someone who routinely takes care of gastric cancer and performs gastric cancer surgery, it is still puzzling to me why younger and younger patients are being diagnosed with gastric cancer, especially among Latinos. The study findings are that Latin young female patients were more likely to have diffuse-type and poorly differentiated tumors and later-stage disease at diagnosis than male patients, with a significantly lower overall survival. The age-gender phenomenon in gastric cancer and the observation of worse prognosis among young women with gastric cancer compared to men have been reported before. This study however is one of the first to my knowledge to report this observation in Latin American patients.

However, the paper needs a significant amount of English proofreading and grammar check. There are many errors and typos.

Reply: We understand the complications in reading the effort needed in grammar check and errors and typos.

Changes in the text: The manuscript has already been doublechecked by the authors and resent to external grammar reviewers.

Here are some suggestions:

Delete "Report here about what does this" in the Key Findings section

Reply: We apologize for he mistake, we have already made the modifications suggested at Key Findings sections.

Changes in the text: Page 3, line 78.

Remove citations from the abstract

Reply: Citations from abstract section have already been removed.

Changes in the text: Page 2, line 51.

The time frame of the study is inconsistent. In the abstract, the authors mentioned 2004-2020; whereas, in the methods section, they mentioned 2004-2019.

Reply: We apologize for the inconsistency of the time frame. We have already modified

the date at the inclusion criteria methods section.

Changes in the text: Page 6, line 125.