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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This case report adds valuable information on cell neuroendocrine carcinoma. The literature review is timely and comprehensive. However, the writing presents some awkward expressions that must be corrected. 1. The most common mistake is the use of an adjective (gastric) instead of a name (stomach). 2. In the Case Report section, the number 2 (two) must be spelled. 3. 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.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This report presents a case of gastric mixed large and small cell neuroendocrine carcinoma. This is a rare entity, and a meaningful report. The manuscript is well-written. However, there are some points that need to be addressed in this report. I have several comments below:

1. 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.

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

3. 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. Comment 2: Most clinicians may be interested in endoscopic and CT findings. Please show the endoscopic and CT images. Comment 3: Figures must be presented in the order that they appear in the main text of the manuscript (numbered as 1, 2, 3).

4. Discussion Comment 1: The logical flow of this section is clear. I agree with the authors’ consideration. The end of the third paragraph: In 2020, a multicenter study in China found that after propensity matching score, ... Comment 2: "Propensity matching score" should be revised to "propensity score matching".
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
All reviewer comments have been addressed appropriately. I would like to pay tribute to the sincere efforts of the authors. However, there are a few minor points that should be corrected in this revised manuscript. I point them out below:

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

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