

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This article is original and highly qualified to add to the evidence of gastric remnant tumors. The hypothesis of the carcinogenesis process proved to be compatible between patients and the theory of tumor occurrence. The author performed a preoperative gastroendoscopy examination, is there any bile reflux on anastomotic gastrojejunostomy? If you found reflux, this will strengthen the hypothesis of GRC. Intra operative findings and discussion of why GRC is in accordance with existing theories. The discussion presented by the author was quite good. It is better to also discuss cases that have occurred before, whether there is GRC in accordance with the reported patient. Patient follow-up was only 6 months, please also add the reported survival rates that have been reported in various studies as a comparison of the patients reported by the author so that doctors can better know the next treatment.

Response: Thank you very much for your suggestions, in the *Case Summary* part and *Endoscopy examination* part, I add the contents about bile reflux, that will strengthen the hypothesis of GRC. In discussion part, I had mentioned that the prognosis of GMNECs is not well-defined for it is a rare type, that's why it is very hard to add the reported survival rates, but for your kindly remind, I also add some case reported so that doctors can better know the next treatment.

4 LANGUAGE QUALITY

Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

5 EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) *Science editor:*

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the mixed neuroendocrine carcinoma of gastric stump. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This article is original and highly qualified to add to the evidence of gastric remnant tumors. The hypothesis of the carcinogenesis process proved to be compatible between patients and the theory of tumor occurrence. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There are 3 figures; (4) References: A total of 21 references are cited, including 3 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is no self-cited reference; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. A language editing certificate issued by Edanz was provided.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the written informed consent. No academic misconduct was found in the 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 WJCC.

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; and (2) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout.

6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

(2) Editorial office director: I have checked the comments written by the Science editor. The questions raised by the reviewers were answered. All PMID and DOI numbers of references were provided in the list. I also uploaded a single PowerPoint file named "**66121-Figures.ppt**", provided original pictures.

(3) Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.