Reviewer #1:
Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Major revision
Specific Comments to Authors: World Journal of gastroenterology–75096-66915 Thank you for having an opportunity to review this case report by Dr. Cai, et al. They reported a literature review of gallbladder neuroendocrine carcinoma. The authors summarized the diagnosis, clinical features, treatment and prognosis of this rare tumor. Although their report is valuable, there are several points to be revised for the acceptance.

Major ：

1. The authors lack Method section. Please describe how to search, include and exclude previous reports in a more detailed way and their plan of statistical analysis. Flow chart of eligibility can assist reader's understanding of this manuscript.

Answer: Thanks a lot for the valuable opinions, according to the suggestion, we added the method of retrieval about SEER database and literature in the text witch including the inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria. We also describe the statistical methods used in this paper . In addition we added the flow chart for readers to understand in the paper.

2. All tables are not well-constructed and bit less easy to understand. Some modifications will be needed, for example, turning tables sideways in Word file.

Answer: Thanks to reviewers for their rigor and carefulness .All charts have been re-edited, and some explanations have been given at the bottom of the charts, hoping to meet the requirements of reviewers

3. Introduction section looks not enough. Please describe and clarify unsolved subjects and problems of previous reports.

Answer: We reviewed the literature again, carefully read and summarized. Finally we added more content in the introduction witch including three controversial and unresolved subjects about GB-NEC.

4. Some specific ultrasonographic, CT, and MRI images of GB-NEC should be provided.

Answer: According to the suggestion , we have added the MRI and pathological Images of GB-NEC

5. In Table 1, please describe units of survival time.

6. "BG-NEC"s are typo in Abstract and Manuscript.

7. Throughout the manuscript, English quality looks not good. Some grammar mistakes are found. Please have an English proofreading again.
Answer: Thanks to reviewers for their rigor and carefulness .This article has been revised and re-edited, and the above questions(question5-7) have been basically solved.

Reviewer #2:
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)
Specific Comments to Authors: Grammar and spelling need more work!

Answer: Thanks to reviewers for their rigor and carefulness .This article has been revised and re-edited, and we hope the language problem can basically meet the requirements of the editorial department.