Responses to Review Comments

We thank the Editor and anonymous Reviewers for their valuable comments. We provide in the following a point-by-point response to the comments.

Response to Editor

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 An null pattern of MMRs proteins. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade B and Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The manuscript is well-written and well-structured. English need to be polished. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There is 1 table and 3 figures; (4) References: A total of 17 references are cited, including 4 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are 1 self-cited references; and (6) References recommendations (kindly remind): 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 B and Grade C. A language editing certificate issued by editage was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Written informed consent and CARE Checklist (2016). No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: 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; (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; (3) The "Case Presentation" section was not written according to the Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation. Please re-write the "Case Presentation" section, and add the "FINAL DIAGNOSIS", "TREATMENT", and "OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP" sections to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

(2) Editorial office director:

(3) 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 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. Before its final acceptance, the author(s) must provide the Signed Informed Consent Form(s) or Document(s). For example, authors from China should upload the Chinese version of the document, authors from Italy should upload the Italian version of the document, authors from Germany should upload the Deutsch version of the document, and authors from the United States and the United Kingdom should upload the English version of the document, etc.

Response: Thank you for your comments. As suggested, we have now revised the paper, from presentation to references. Major revisions are listed below.

(1) We have rewrote the "Case Presentation" section, and added the "FINAL

DIAGNOSIS", "TREATMENT", and "OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP" sections to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision.

(2) Deleteded 2 sentences and relative 2 references (the 2nd paragraph in ***Pathological and laboratory examinations***, *"Many studies had shown that MSI-H is associated with MLHl promoter methylation. However, the presence of MSI-H is not certain in gastric cancer patients with MLHl promoter methylation, and not all patients with MSI-H gastric cancer have MLHl promoter methylation[8,9]. "*). The references are not appropriate in result. So we deleted this 2 sentences and relative 2 references.

(3) Revised the references according to the Format for references guidelines.

Response to Reviewer 1

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors reported an interesting and enjoyable case of a patient that had gastric cancer not expressing any mismatch repair peotein. These cases are very rare and their occurrence in the stomach is even rarer. The manuscript is well-written and well-structured. The title is clear and reflects the manuscrit. The abstract is breif and concise. The introduction gives a good background about the disease. The case is well-presented and the used figures are informative. The discussion is thorough and informative. I have only one comment: The language needs to be revised. I suggest having it corrected by someone fluent in English.

Response: Thank you for your evaluation and affirmation. We have revised the language seriously.

Response to Reviewer 2

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The content of the study is interesting, but it has significant grammatical mistakes, please you have to review it.

Response: Thank you for your comments. We did find some mistakes. We have revised the language seriously.