

Dear Dr. Wang,

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript, we appreciate editor and reviewers very much for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript. We have revised the paper (Manuscript NO. 74517, Mixed large and small cell neuroendocrine carcinoma of the stomach: A case report and literature review), and would like to re-submit it to the World Journal of Clinical Cases for your consideration. We have carefully taken the reviewers' comments into account and provided responses to each of the points raised by the reviewers. The amendments are highlighted in red in the revised manuscript. We hope that the revision is acceptable, and we look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Dongbing Zhao

Round-1

List of Responses

Replies to Reviewer 1

1.The reviewer's comment: TITLE OF CASE Comment: The word "gastric" is an adjective, so the title should be rewritten as "Gastric mixed large and small cell neuroendocrine carcinoma" or "Mixed large and small cell neuroendocrine carcinoma of the stomach". Please revise the relevant part throughout the manuscript.

The authors' answer: We really appreciate your help. We are very sorry for our incorrect writing. The precedent version of the title has been replaced, becoming "Mixed large and small cell neuroendocrine carcinoma of the stomach: A case report and literature review". And we have revised the relevant part throughout the manuscript. (Page1 line1; Page 2 line 9, 19, 26; Page 3 line 10; Page 5, line 10; Page 10 line 23)

2.The reviewer's comment: Abstract Comment: The abstract should be divided into three sections, "BACKGROUND", "CASE SUMMARY" and "CONCLUSION", according to the guidelines of the journal.

The authors' answer: Thanks a lot. We are very sorry for our negligence of the guidelines of the journal. And we have divided the abstract into three sections. (Page 2)

3. The reviewer's comment: Case report Comment 1: Please revise this section according to the guidelines of the journal: 1) Chief complaints; 2) History of present illness; 3) History of past illness; 4) Personal and family history; 5) Physical examination upon admission; 6) Laboratory examinations; 7) Imaging examinations, and so on.

The authors' answer: Thank you very much. We are very sorry that we referred to a previous old article and neglected the guidelines of the journal. And we have revised the section as recommended. (Page 3-4)

4. The reviewer's comment: Most clinicians may be interested in endoscopic and CT findings. Please show the endoscopic and CT images.

The authors' answer: I am truly grateful for your help. Considering the Reviewer's suggestion, we have showed the endoscopic and CT images. (Page 5 line 1-7)

5. The reviewer's comment: Figures must be presented in the order that they appear in the main text of the manuscript (numbered as 1, 2, 3).

The authors' answer: We really appreciate it. We have made correction according to the Reviewer's comments. (Page 5,6)

6. The reviewer's comment: The end of the third paragraph: In 2020, a multicenter study in China found that after propensity matching score, ..."Propensity matching score" should be revised to "propensity score matching".

The authors' answer: Thanks again. It is really true as Reviewer suggested. And we have corrected the mistake. (Page 9 line 6)

Replies to Reviewer 2

1.The reviewer's comment: The most common mistake is the use of an adjective (gastric) instead of a name (stomach).

The authors' answer: We are very grateful for the suggestion. We have modified the inappropriate use of (gastric) throughout the text. (Page1 line1; Page 2 line 9, 19, 26; Page 3 line 10; Page 5, line 10; Page 10 line 23)

2.The reviewer's comment: In the Case Report section, the number 2 (two) must be spelled

The authors' answer: We are very sorry for our incorrect writing. And we have corrected the mistake. (Page 3 line 15)

3. The reviewer's comment: In the same section, the sense is incomplete when it is reported the patient complained discomfort visited a clinic. I believe that an adverb is missing in this sentence.

The authors' answer: Considering the Reviewer's suggestion, we have adjusted the sentence. (Page 3 line 15)

Replies to Science editor:

1. The editor's comment: The article needs a great deal of language polishing, such as the use of an adjective (gastric) instead of a name (stomach).

The authors' answer: It is really true as Reviewer suggested. We have polished the language of the paper. Thanks for your advice.

2. The editor's comment: The format of the article does not conform to the format of case report, and the author needs to adjust the format.

The authors' answer: Thank you so much. We are very sorry that we referred to a previous article and neglected the format of the journal. And we have revised the article as recommended.

3. The editor's comment: The treatment and outcome of patients need to be supplemented, so that the case can be considered complete.

The authors' answer : Considering the Reviewer's suggestion, we have supplemented the treatment and outcome of the patient. Special thanks for your good comments

We would like to express our sincere thanks to the reviewers for the constructive and positive comments. We really appreciate it for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Round-2

Dear Dr. Ma,

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript, we respect editor and reviewers for their careful and constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript. We have revised the paper (Manuscript NO. 74517, Mixed large and small cell neuroendocrine carcinoma of the stomach: A case report and literature review), and would like to re-submit it to the World Journal of Clinical Cases for your consideration. We have carefully taken the reviewers' comments into account and provided responses to each of the points raised by the reviewers. The amendments are highlighted in orange in the revised manuscript. We hope that the revision is acceptable, and we look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Dongbing Zhao

Round-2

List of Responses

Replies to Reviewer 1

1.The reviewer's comment : 1. FINAL DIAGNOSIS The patient was diagnosed with gastric (L/SCNEC) pT2N2M0 (stage IIA)... Comment: "with gastric" should be revised to "with gastric cancer"..

The authors' answer: We really appreciate your help. We are very sorry for our incorrect writing. We have made correction according to the Reviewer's comments. (Page 6 line 18)

2.The reviewer's comment: DISCUSSION ...the same kind of precursor cells. However, makuuchi et al [17] found that... Comment: "makuuchi" should be revised to "Makuuchi".

The authors' answer: Thanks again for your careful review. It is really true as Reviewer suggested. And we have corrected the mistake. (Page 10 line 8)

We would like to express our sincere thanks to the reviewers for the constructive and careful comments. We really appreciate it for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.