

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gist-21-6>

Reviewer A

1) Lines: 158-161. Provide more details about how the PubMed search was conducted. How many reports were reviewed, how many included and how many excluded? What were the search terms used? Provide a date for “till date”.

Reply: Details improved

2) The grammar needs improvement.

Reply: Grammar was partially modified

3) Minor:

Gene names should be written in italics

line 30: D842V

line 71: Explain activation cycle. Do the authors mean the activation loop?

line 90: In the trial described in ref #26 the imatinib dose was not uniformly 400 mg/d, but randomly assigned either 400 mg or 600 mg/d.

line 127: The median time to progression has been >2 yrs in some more recent series addressing patients with smaller tumor burden

Lines 315-324: One could mention a recently published report by Eriksson M et al. ESMO Open 2021 Jul 13;6(4):100217.

Line 355: Consider adding a title to the paragraph discussing FGFR inhibitors.

Reply: Thank you. All the suggestions were followed

Reviewer B

1) The methods part of abstract is not informative. Please briefly indicate the literature search, date of search, and keywords used. The authors described this study as a systematic review but in fact it was a narrative review.

Reply: We added further informations

2) Second, in the introduction part of the main text, please briefly describe the clinical significance of this review topic and why the review is needed. Comments on the limitations of traditional TKIs and the strengths of novel TKIs may be needed.

Reply: Thank you for your suggestion. This part was improved

3) Third, in the main text, the authors reviewed a lot of studies with a focus on their results. However, it is also necessary to have comments on the risk of bias or methodology quality of studies reviewed because this is relate to the level of clinical evidence.

Reply: Some details were added in the main text as suggested.

4)Fourth, in the conclusion part, extensive insights on challenges, opportunities, and possible solutions are needed.

Reply: We have revised the conclusion as suggested