

Point-by-point responses to the issues raised in the peer-review report(s):

Reviewer #1:

1. In "Physical examination upon admission" mentioned "His father died of lung cancer". I think it's a writing error. Please revise.

Yes, this is a writing error. And I have deleted this sentence in this section.

2. In DISCUSSION, "Our experience indicated the importance of early detection and comprehensive screening in patients with high risk of cancer". In fact, for all malignancies, early detection is crucial, not just multiple malignancies. Regrettably, the author did not discuss or offer the experience in the early detection or risk factors of multiple malignancies through this case. Suggest you rewrite the conclusion.

Thank you for your kind suggestion. In this case, the patient had multiple cancer-related risk factors like family history and cancer promoting aspects of lifestyle (heavy drinking, smoking, frequently hot food). As prognosis of multiple primary malignancy varies a lot due to cancer type and stage at initial diagnosis. In this case, all malignancies were in advance stage. Despite radical surgery and adjuvant chemotherapy, he died of widespread metastases 33 months later. The conclusion was rewrite as "Our experience indicated the poor prognosis of synchronous multiple advanced primary malignancies and the importance of comprehensive assessment for high-risk populations."

Reviewer #2:

The introduction should be focused on the main topic. Please delete the sentences regarding the Pubmed Search. The discussion should be shortened. The conclusion is too obvious. A consideration on the clinical implications must be made.

Thank you for your kind suggestions. I have deleted the sentences regarding the Pubmed Search in the introduction part and rewrite the discussion part. Moreover, the conclusion was rewrite.

Comment:

This is an interesting case report regarding Synchronous multiple primary malignancies of the esophagus, stomach, and jejunum. The authors reported the CARE guidelines and respected the methodology. I have the following comments: The introduction should be focused on the main topic. Please delete the sentences regarding the Pubmed Search. The discussion should be shortened. The conclusion is too obvious. A consideration on the clinical implications must be made.

Thanks for your comment.