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Dear JMCR Editorial team,
Attached is the revised manuscript with necessary changes according to reviewers’ recommendation.
Below are the reviewers’ comments and the changes done regarding each point.
Best regards,
Cherif Boutros M.D.

Reviewer's report (1)
Title: Intestinal neuroendocrine tumor in a patient with pituitary adenoma. Case report and review of the current screening recommendations.
Version: 2 Date: 16 August 2007
Reviewer: Francesco Dentali
I am familiar with the literature and believe that this case meets one of the 7 criteria for evaluation in the journal: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease
Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes
Is the case report authentic?: Yes
Is this case worth reporting?: Yes
Is the case report persuasive?: Yes
Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes
Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No
Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Comments to authors:
General
In this manuscript, the authors reported an uncommon case of intestinal neuroendocrine tumor in a patient with previous pituitary adenoma. The case report is of some interest and well written.
Specific comments
1. Sometimes (eg in the abstract) MEN is written NEN, please correct
   Necessary correction done
2. In the background section, gastroenteropancreatic should not be abbreviated since it was not used any more.
   Necessary correction done
3. The authors stated that the patient did not complain any symptom (eg weight loss, wheezing, …) during follow up. However, it’s not clear if the patients had one or more of these symptoms before intestinal neuroendocrine tumour diagnosis. Please, add this information.
   The patient did not have any of these symptoms before the diagnosis of intestinal neuroendocrine tumor, this information is added to the revised manuscript document.
4. Some figures did not add any useful information, please reduce the number.
   The CT scan with intestinal obstruction figure is deleted on the new manuscript document
5. Discussion (and “conclusion” in the abstract) should be toned down since to
screen for the presence of neuroendocrine tumors, patients suspected to have endocrine tumors is not based on evidence. Furthermore, symptoms generally do not occur unless the tumor has spread to the liver.

**Necessary changes done**

---

Revisions necessary for publication

**What next?:** Accept after minor revisions

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

---

**Reviewer’s report**

**Title:** Intestinal neuroendocrine tumor in a patient with pituitary adenoma. Case report and review of the current screening recommendations.

**Version:** 2  **Date:** 7 August 2007

**Reviewer:** Peter Laszlo Lakatos

I am familiar with the literature and believe that this case meets one of the 7 criteria for evaluation in the journal: An unexpected association between diseases or symptoms

**Has the case been reported coherently?:** Yes

**Is the case report authentic?:** Yes

**Is this case worth reporting?:** Yes

**Is the case report persuasive?:** Yes

**Does the case report have explanatory value?:** No

**Does the case report have diagnostic value?:** No

**Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?:** No

**Comments to authors:**

**General**

This is an extremely rare association reported in the patient with no clear clinical message, therefore the clinical importance is rather questionable.

As it is a rare association it is necessary to report it in the literature, the clinical message, as described on the manuscript, is to be aware of this rare association and include investigational studies to rule it out in patients suspected to have MEN syndrome. Another point is that this association helps us to better understand the general tissue concept of NET affecting a diffuse neuroendocrine system.

---

Revisions necessary for publication

**What next?:** Reject

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

---

**Reviewer’s report**
Title: Intestinal neuroendocrine tumor in a patient with pituitary adenoma. Case report and review of the current screening recommendations.

Version: 2 Date: 6 August 2007
Reviewer: Basilios Papaziogas

I am familiar with the literature and believe that this case meets one of the 7 criteria for evaluation in the journal: New associations or variations in disease processes

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes
Is the case report authentic?: Yes
Is this case worth reporting?: Yes
Is the case report persuasive?: Yes
Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes
Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes
Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Comments to authors:
General
The case report is adequately presented. The discussion is focused and detailed.

Revisions necessary for publication
What next?: Accept
Quality of written English: Acceptable