

Dear Editor Prof. Na Ma,

Thank you very much for your positive reply on our manuscript (Manuscript NO.: 54907). Also we greatly appreciate the reviewers for their kind suggestions and comments. On the occasion, we have carefully checked the manuscript again, and polished the Manuscript English accordingly. More details are expressed in the following item by item reply. The authors are grateful to the Associate Editor and anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments which have helped to improve the quality of the paper.

Response to Editor:

Key points of revising the manuscript:

1. ***Scientific quality:*** We have resolved all issues in the manuscript on the basis of peer review report, and made a point-to-point response to the peer review report.
2. ***Language quality:*** We have resolved all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report, and the manuscript has been polished by native-English speakers.
3. ***Special requirements for figures:*** In the manuscript, figures have been presented in the order, and the figures and the text in the figures are editable. We have prepared and arranged the figures using the PowerPoint, and the color for contrast has been changed based on the request.
4. ***Special requirements for tables:*** The tables are arranged in the order in which they appear in the manuscript, and we have resolved all issues in the table.
5. ***Special requirements for references:*** We have revised the references throughout and the references issues have been resolved. However, the DOI of reference 25 can't be found.

- 6. *Special requirements for article highlights:*** We have finished the writing of article highlights based on the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision.
- 7. *Ethical documents:*** We have checked the accuracy of all ethical documents, and the completeness of the documents has been confirmed.
- 8. *Approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s):*** We don't have supportive foundations.
- 9.** As required, we have uploaded a revised manuscript in native format (.DOC), and addressed all the comments and questions from the reviewers. In our Answering Letter, we inserted our responses after the reviewer's comments, marked by the phrase "reply", and also indicated the locations (page and line numbers) in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Very interesting. No comments. Thank you.

Reply: Greatly appreciate the positive comments from Reviewer #1 and thank you very much.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This study of the clinical characteristic of primary hepatic neuroendocrine tumors after comprehensive therapy is very interesting. I read the manuscript with great interesting. The manuscript is very well written. Methods and results are presented in order, very detail. Tables and figures are good. Figure 3 should be updated, it seems the scale bar is too small. Some minor editing is required.

Reply: Thanks for the kind suggestion from the reviewer #2. The figure has been updated, and we have scaled up the size of the scale bar on the basis of request.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Neuroendocrine tumors are uncommon low-malignancy tumors, and mostly originating from bronchopulmonary and gastrointestinal sites. The most common primary site of metastatic hepatic neuroendocrine tumors is the lungs, followed by the pancreas and the small intestine. The primary hepatic neuroendocrine tumors are extremely rare. Studies are needed to figure out its clinicopathological features and prognostic factors, finally facilitate the diagnosis and treatment of primary hepatic neuroendocrine tumors. In this study, the authors analysed the clinicopathological characteristics of primary hepatic neuroendocrine tumors. And the various therapies used to treat these patients and corresponding outcomes are discussed in this article, and survival analysis was utilized to find out specific prognostic risk factors, finally making further improvement in treatments and outcomes. Generally speaking, this study is well designed and the manuscript is very well written. I only have some minor comments:

1. Please add a short paragraph to discuss the limit of the study.

Reply: Thanks for the reviewer's positive comments.

We have added a short paragraph in Discussion to address the limit of the study in the manuscript (Please see Page 11, Line 26). (This study plays an important role in facilitating the diagnosis and treatment of PHNETs, and provides novel insights into the risk factors related to overall survival. However, there are several limitations in this study as it is designed as a retrospective analysis based on a small sample size due to the rare incidence of PHNETs. In addition, several patients were lost to follow-up which leads to the incompleteness of survival status. Thus, there is clearly a need for prospective, multicenter, large-scale trials to aid surgical decision-making in the future regarding the treatment of PHNETs.)

2. The figures are not so clear, please update.

Reply: Thanks for the reviewer's nice suggestion.

The figures were embedded in the manuscript, which may make the figures unclear. We have updated the figures and submitted these clear figures separately.

3. Manuscript requires a minor language editing.

Reply: Thanks for the kind suggestion from the reviewer #3.

We have carefully checked the manuscript again, and polished the Manuscript English by AJE. The language editing certificate from AJE is available in the document.

Science Editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of the clinical characteristic and outcome of primary hepatic neuroendocrine tumors after comprehensive therapy. The topic is within the scope of the WJGO. (1) Classification: Three Grades B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The various therapies used to treat these patients and corresponding outcomes are discussed in this article, and

survival analysis was utilized to find out specific prognostic risk factors, finally making further improvement in treatments and outcomes. This study is well designed and the manuscript is very well written; and (3) Format: There are 2 tables and 5 figures. A total of 28 references are cited, including 7 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and two Grades B. A language editing certificate issued by AJE was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. Written informed consent was waived. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJGO. 5 Issues raised:

(1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

Reply: Greatly appreciate the positive comments from science editor.

We have prepared and arranged the figures using the PowerPoint, and all the figures are editable.

(2) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text. 6 Re-Review: Not required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Reply: Thanks for the kind suggestion from science editor.

We have finished the writing of article highlights at the end of the main text based on the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision (Please see Page 12, Line 14).

Editorial Office Director:

I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

Company Editor-in-Chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revisions. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

[Many thanks for spending time to review our work, thank you very much.](#)