Response to Reviewer #1:

1. End first sentence at rare.
   Response: I have made changes in the manuscript. In BACKGROUND, Malignant tumors of the appendix are extremely rare, constituting about 1% of all gastrointestinal tumors.

2. What is the duration being referred to her? Please explain how long from time of presentation or time of surgery more clearly.
   Response: The patient began to receive chemotherapy 45 days after the operation. Up to January 2022, six courses of XELOX chemotherapy regimen (Oxaliplatin + Capecitabine) have been completed, and there was no evidence of recurrence.

3. Also please mention further instructions provided to patient regarding follow up and what is expected as per standard guidelines- 10 years?
   Response: MAA with signet-ring cell features is considered more invasive and has a worse prognosis. The patient requires regular follow-up every four months for three years, every six months for the next two years, and then every year for the next 15 years, following initial therapy.

4. Is there a role for colonoscopy in this patient to detect concomitant colorectal invasion of tumor? Please elaborate if yes or no and why.
   Response: In most cases, appendiceal malignancy is detected accidentally by abdominal CT or surgery for appendicitis due to other reasons. Appendiceal cancer is difficult to be found even by preoperative colonoscopy. In the case of submucosal lesions of the cecum near the mouth of the appendix or mucus flowing out of the mouth of the appendix, the treating physician should be highly vigilant against appendiceal lesions.

5. Can we expand on this in discussion- what therapies work best? What percentage patients enter remission?
   Response: In mucous neoplasms, we do believe that a right hemicolectomy should definitely be performed if required for tumor clearance because a complete cytoreduction of mucous tumors of the appendix is associated with improved survival, a survival advantage of 29% for right hemicolectomy over appendicectomy.

6. Language and grammar problems
   Response: We have corrected manuscript by native speakers of English.

Reviewer #2: It is a well written case report about a rare but important clinical condition, which could easily get missed. Author has done all investigations appropriately to reach on final diagnosis. Good introduction and discussion.
Response to Reviewer #2: Thank you so much for your positive comments.
Reviewer #3: This is a well-written and brief work. The introduction is relevant and theoretical in nature. The previous studies are described in good detail for readers. The authors did a good job in concluding data and bringing it in a simple way. This is a high-quality review of this condition. This condition is rare but the authors did a good job.

Response to Reviewer #3: Thank you so much for your positive comments.