

1. Reviewer one, answer:

This manuscript entitled “ The Role of Somatostatin Receptor Scintigraphy in the Follow up of Patients with Neuroendocrine Neoplasms of Appendix” is an original manuscript that evaluates the role of SRS in ANETs management. This is a well written paper that needs only minor language/grammar editing. Minor comments: - minor language/grammar editing. I would advise that authors read again and polish their manuscript. (for example: “... Majority ... “ instead of “...The majority”, two spaces between words instead of one, etc.) - Table 1: Please, reconsider the use of the word “Pathophysiology”; any of the following terms would be more precise: pathology, histology, histopathology. - Table 1: right hemicolectomy should be considered instead of hemicolecotomy. - It is not clear when the patients underwent SRS during their FU period. - Please, introduce every acronym at the 1st time it is used in the main text

Answer: Everything is accepted and corrected.

Major comments - In the methods section, authors should describe the nature of their study, i.e. prospective, retrospective, retrospective analysis of a prospective register. - In the methods section, authors should provide information regarding the institutional ethical committee approval and any waiver regarding patients’ informed consent. - In the discussion section, authors should more thoroughly point out the significance of their findings in terms of what they add beyond the already known, or to compare their findings with the rest of the literature on the subject and present the differences clearly.

Answer: Everything is accepted and corrected.

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

2. Reviewer 2 answer:

Anonymous

Review Date: 2020-06-01 05:48

Specific Comments To Authors: This study investigated the role of SRS in the follow up of 41 patients appendiceal NET (APNET) and concluded value of SRS in the follow-up of the patients with ANET after surgery, if recurrences or metastases are suspected. Major concerns: (1) Goblet cell carcinoid (GCC) is not a carcinoid tumor and has been classified as goblet cell adenocarcinoma by the most recent WHO tumor classification of GI tract. I would recommend that the authors either eliminate this group of tumor in this study or analyze the performance of SRS in classical APNET and GCC separately.

Answer: Everything is accepted and corrected. GCC are excluded, but now, all the statistics is changed a little.

(2) One important prognostic factor of APNET is the size of tumor, which has been used in TNM classification of APNET. I would suggest that the authors provide more up to date TMN classification of the APNET tumors enrolled in this study. It would be interesting to analyze the performance of SRS on APNET stratified by TNM classification of the resected tumors. I suggest including a pathologist in this study to better classify these APNETs.

Answer: Everything is accepted. We have excluded GCC, and introduced stage of the disease according to TNM classification. We had some consultations with pathologists, but his name is not in the paper. Any further and detailed TNM elaboration will require writing another paper. We have tried to preserve this paper concise and precise.

(3) Most APNET are either G1 or G2. The incidence of G3 APNET is extremely low. However, 27% of tumors in this study are G3 tumors, suggesting a selection bias in this study. Would it be more appropriate to change the study title to “The Role of Somatostatin Receptor Scintigraphy in the Follow up of Patients with high grade/high stage/advanced Neuroendocrine Neoplasms of Appendix”, given that most low stage APNETs do not require clinical follow-up?

Answer: with the exclusion of GCC, 17% of the patients are G3, so the authors do not think that the change of the title is necessary. If reviewer insists, we can do so.

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

3. WJG Editor comments:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of the neuroendocrine neoplasms. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade B and Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This is a well written paper that needs only minor language/grammar editing. It is not clear when the patients underwent SRS during their FU period. In the discussion section, authors should more thoroughly point out the significance of their findings in terms of what they add beyond the already known, or to compare their findings with the rest of the literature on the subject and present the differences clearly. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered;

Answer: done

and (3) Format: There are 2 tables and 4 figures. A total of 30 references are cited, including 9 references published in the last 3 years. There are 4 self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B and Grade B. 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 Bing search. The highest single-source similarity index in the CrossCheck report showed to be 17%. According to our policy, the overall similarity index should be less than 30%, and the single-source similarity should be less than 5%. Please rephrase these repeated sentences.

Answer: We have rephrased the repeated sentences, although majority is from our paper written in *Via Medica*.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by Ministry of Science and Technology Republic of Serbia. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG.

Answer:

1. **Artiko V**, Marković AK, Sobić-Šaranović D, Petrović M, Antić A, Stojković M, Zuvela M, Saranović D, Stojković M, Radovanović N, Galun D, Milovanović A, Milovanović J, Bobić-Radovanović A, Krivokapic Z, Obradović V. Monoclonal immunoscintigraphy for detection of metastasis and recurrence of colorectal cancer. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2011 May 21;17(19):2424-30. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v17.i19.2424
2. Stojković MV, **Artiko VM**, Radoman IB, Knezević SJ, Lukić SM, Kerkez MD, Lekić NS, Antić AA, Zuvela MM, Ranković VI, Petrović MN, Sobić DP, Obradović VB. Color Doppler sonography and angioscintigraphy in hepatic Hodgkin's lymphoma. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2009 Jul 14;15(26):3269-75. doi: 10.3748/wjg.15.3269.
3. Rovcanin B, Ivanovski I, Djuric O, Nikolic D, **Petrovic J (Saponjski J, the same as Petrovic J, maiden name)** Ivanovski P. Mitotic crossover--an evolutionary rudiment which promotes carcinogenesis of colorectal carcinoma. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2014 Sep 21;20(35):12522-5. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v20.i35.12522

5 Issues raised: (1) I found no "Author contribution" section. Please provide the author contributions;

Šaponjski Jelena underwent nuclear medicine investigation, visualization and interpretation of the results and wrote the paper.

Ognjanović Sanja, Božić Antić Ivana and Pavlovic Djordje investigated the patients as clinicians and coordinated all the clinical investigations as well as analyzed the results.

Macut Djuro, Šobić Šaranović Dragana and Artiko Vera made general conception of the paper and review of the literature, review and re-review and analyzed the results.

Artiko Vera and Šobić Šaranović Dragana did visualization and interpretation of the results.

(2) I found the authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s);

Answer: Ministry of Science Republic of Serbia do not issue grant application forms. It is mandatory that in any paper written through this project on Faculty of Medicine University of Belgrade we write the project number. Upon the publishing on the paper, the project grant number and information can be found when paper is on WoS. I have attached the approval document from Faculty of medicine University of Balgrade as an e-mail.

(3) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. 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;

Answer: The figures are original, included in the text as required, but we will attach it also separately in Power Point presentation.

(4) I found the authors did not write the “article highlight” section. Please write the “article highlights” section at the end of the main text.

Answer: Done

6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

TO THE EDITOR:

Considering that I have accepted all the suggestions by reviewers and have provided everything that was mentioned by the Editor of World Journal of Gastroenterology, including the fact that our group has already published 3 papers in WJG, I would like you to reconsider acceptance of the paper in World Journal of Gastroenterology or at least World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology. If this is not possible, **I accept the publication in World Journal of Clinical Cases.**