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Reviewer's report:

This study is fairly well presented; however, its interest and its conclusions are rather limited because, in this pathology, brain metastases are rare and it would have been necessary to compare the current group with the complete group of NECs, to know, in addition to the frequency, if was a Prognosis factor of the disease. That was the purpose of this study, but you do not talk about it later. In addition, you mention the interest of early imaging but as you do not show the entire cohort with or without BM and it is impossible to conclude, these are just hypotheses.

P3 L19 Define GEP - NEN

P 8 G1 G2 : please provide signification of abbreviations

P9 L24 "Patients with survival times more than 24 months after diagnosis of brain metastases (BM) and patients with metachronous BM (at least 12 months after initial diagnosis) were evaluated separately." Explain why you evaluate separately

P12 L39 "For patients with small cell lung cancer and BM, stereotactic radiosurgery combined with WBRT has been recommended as first choice treatment [21]." You excluded these patients from your analyze first!

Conclusion :

You cannot affirm that BM impair prognosis as you do not provide any data on patients without BM
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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