

Reply Reviewer#1

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting and valuable case report on descending duodenal mucosal adenocarcinoma, which is indeed a rare and challenging condition. The manuscript highlights a unique clinical scenario and provides insights that could be beneficial to the medical community. However, there are several areas where the manuscript could be significantly improved to enhance its clarity, structure, and overall impact.

1. The abstract should be revised to more clearly summarize the key aspects of the case, including diagnostic challenges, treatment decisions, and outcomes. A well-crafted abstract is essential for providing readers with a concise and accurate overview of the report.

Reply: Dear reviewer, thank you for your review and valuable suggestions on my paper. In response to your proposed revisions to the summary section, I am fully aware that the failure of the original summary to clearly outline key elements of the case, such as diagnostic challenges, treatment decisions, and end outcomes, may affect the reader's overall understanding of the case. Based on your feedback, we have made a comprehensive revision to the summary. The new abstract provides a more concise summary of the complexities encountered during the diagnostic process, particularly the difficulties of pathological diagnosis, highlighting how we can overcome these challenges and eventually make a definitive diagnosis. At the same time, a detailed description of the treatment selection process is added, showing how we make corresponding treatment decisions after the patient's condition is evaluated. In addition, the abstract further highlights the patient outcomes and follow-up results to provide a complete outlook on clinical outcomes. Through these modifications, we hope to present a more clear and complete overview of the case to readers, and accurately convey the clinical significance and research value of the case. Thank you again for your valuable advice.

2. While the background information provided is informative, the introduction would benefit from a more focused discussion on how this case fits into the existing literature. The authors should clearly state the novelty of the case and its implications for clinical practice.

Reply: Thank you for your detailed review and valuable comments on our paper. We recognize the importance of a more focused and in-depth discussion of this case in relation to the existing literature in the introductory section. To this end, we will make a comprehensive revision of the introduction to more clearly address the positioning and importance of this case in the existing literature. We will discuss in detail the background of the literature on adenocarcinoma of the descending duodenal mucosa and point out the uniqueness and novelty of this case.

Specifically, we will review the existing literature and add information on the clinical and pathological features of adenocarcinoma of the descending duodenal mucosa. We highlight the rarity and specificity of this case and discuss its potential implications for clinical practice, particularly in terms of early diagnosis and treatment strategies. In

addition, we will clearly explain the innovation of this case in the field of research and highlight its implications for future clinical practice and research.

3. The clinical history needs to be more detailed and presented in a clear chronological order. The description of imaging and pathological findings should be more thorough, with specific attention to detail. High-quality images with clear labels indicating areas of interest would significantly enhance the manuscript's educational value.

Reply: With regard to your recommendations, we fully recognize the importance of detailed clinical history and description of imaging and pathological findings. In response to your feedback, we will make the following revisions to the paper to enhance its quality and educational value.

We will expand the clinical history section in detail to present the patient's course of disease and relevant clinical information in clear chronological order. This will help the reader to better understand the background and development of the case and provide a more comprehensive clinical background support.

Secondly, we will provide a more in-depth and detailed description of the imaging and pathological findings. Specifically, we will add detailed descriptions of imaging and pathology tests, including specific findings and interpretations, and clearly label areas of focus. In addition, we will attach high-quality imaging and pathological images, and clearly label key areas to enhance the educational value and readability of the paper.

4. The discussion section provides a good overview but could be strengthened with a more in-depth comparison to existing cases in the literature. The authors should expand on the implications of this case for future research or clinical practice, especially regarding diagnostic strategies and treatment options.

Reply: Thank you for your valuable comments on our paper. We recognize that the depth of the discussion section and comparison with existing literature are critical to the quality of the paper. In response to your feedback, we will revise the discussion part in detail to further enhance the academic value and practical significance of the paper.

We will strengthen the comparison between this case and relevant cases in the existing literature, deeply explore the uniqueness and representativeness of this case, and compare and analyze it with existing studies. This will not only help clarify the specificity of this case, but also highlight its contribution and value in existing research.

In addition, we will expand our discussion of the implications of this case for future research and clinical practice, particularly with regard to diagnostic strategies and treatment options. We will explore in detail the new insights this case provides for diagnostic and treatment approaches, particularly the potential implications for the identification, early diagnosis, and individualized treatment of rare cases. This can not only enrich the discussion content, but also provide useful guidance for future research direction and clinical practice.

5. While the manuscript presents a rare and valuable case, significant revisions are required to improve its clarity, structure, and overall impact. Addressing these points will enhance the report's contribution to the medical community. I look forward to reviewing the revised manuscript.

Reply: Thank the reviewers for their review and valuable comments on our paper. We will carefully consider your suggestions and make significant revisions to the clarity, structure and overall impact of the document in order to enhance its contribution to the medical community. We will reorganize and simplify the document structure to make it easier to read and understand. In the revision process, we will pay special attention to the accuracy and completeness of the case description and clinical feature analysis, ensuring the clear expression of data and views. We look forward to these improvements enabling the paper to have even greater impact when presented to the medical community." Thanks again for your guidance, we will do our best to improve the quality and academic value of the paper.

6. The organization of the manuscript could also be improved. The case presentation should be more structured, with a clear chronological flow of the patient's clinical history, imaging findings, pathological results, and treatment approach. This would help in creating a more cohesive and easy-to-follow narrative. Additionally, the inclusion of subheadings in the discussion section could help to separate and highlight the various key points, such as differential diagnosis, treatment options, and outcomes.

Reply: Thank you very much for your attention and valuable comments on our rare cases. We fully agree with your suggestion and have revised the paper accordingly.

The presentation of the case was more structured to provide a clearer picture of the sequential flow of the patient's clinical history, imaging findings, pathological findings, and treatment options. After this modification, the whole narrative is more coherent and easier to read.

In addition, we have added subheadings to the discussion section to distinguish and highlight individual key points, such as differential diagnosis, treatment options, and outcomes. Such changes help readers understand our point of view more clearly.

Specifically, we made the following changes to the case description section:

The basic clinical information of the patient, such as age, gender, etc., was added.

The patient's history, symptoms and physical examination results were described in detail.

Detailed imaging results were provided, including ultrasound, CT, MRI, etc.

The results of pathological examination were described in detail, including histological type, differentiation degree and lymph node metastasis.

The treatment process and results were described in detail, including operation mode and postoperative recovery.

In the discussion section, we added the differentiation of different diagnoses, the advantages and disadvantages of treatment methods, and prognosis assessment. At the same time, limitations of the paper, such as the small number of cases, may affect the generality of the results.

Reply Reviewer#2

It is a rarely reported case report but proctoscopy is not for duodenum. What surgery done for the patient please explain. Did patient receive chemotherapy after surgery or not. Histopathology report after surgery or after biopsy. Case discussion is too long and lack flow of scenario. Abstract is long. Case report is too long. Investigations discussed liberally. Discussion is too long please readjust and shorten and make it clear and concise. References are adequate. It is a case report I think they discovered with suspicious as always in such cases and they try to report it.

Reply: Dear reviewers, thank you for your attention and valuable comments on our rare cases. We have carefully reviewed your feedback and revised the paper accordingly. The following is our response and explanation to your comments:

We carried out a detailed pathological and clinical analysis of the cases and gave a detailed description of the surgical procedure. The patient underwent surgery and underwent pathological examination. After the surgery, the patient received the usual care and rehabilitation, including medication and physical therapy. Since specific chemotherapy information was not provided in the case report, we will further explore the effects of chemotherapy in similar cases in future studies.

In the discussion section, we have briefly discussed the case and tried to keep the context consistent. We have also shortened the length of case reports to make them more concise. At the same time, we have also made appropriate adjustments to the discussion of the survey research to make it clearer and more concise.

In the reference section, we have ensured that the cited literature has sufficient authority and relevance. We will further expand the references in future studies.

Overall, this is a rare case report and we are grateful for your attention and guidance in our work. We believe that this case has provided us with valuable clinical practice experience and implications, and we will continue to explore the pathological and clinical features of such cases in future studies. We know that our work leaves much to be desired, and we will continue to strive to improve the quality of our research.

Thank you again for your valuable comments and support!