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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Reviewers
Reviewer 1:
Eleni Papaoiconomou, Ph.D (Reviewer 1): Interesting case.
I would like to kindly ask the authors if they excluded hook effect at calcitonin and CEA samples collected postoperatively, after the establishment of diagnosis.
Thanks to the Reviewer for the appreciable comments and suggestions. No unfortunately most of the routine serum tests were performed in an external laboratory by the patient and the laboratory was not able to perform “advanced test” to exclude the hook effect.

Reviewer 2:

Punit Sharma, MD, FEBNM, FANMB (Reviewer 2): In this article the authors have presented an interesting case of recurrent MTC with double negative calcitonin and CEA. The authors have presented their case, presented a review of available literature of such cases and discussed the possible causes for such a scenario. The manuscript while is interesting, it needs major revisions before being considered for publication. My comments to authors are detailed below.

Thanks to the Reviewer for the appreciable comments and suggestions

1. The manuscript needs some typographical, grammatical and English corrections. I have highlighted some of them in pdf file. Kindly take help of an expert.

According to the Reviewer suggestion an English proof reading was carried out.

2. There appears to be some typographical error in the title of the article itself! It should read "Medullary Thyroid Carcinoma with double negative calcitonin and CEA: A case report and update of literature review"

The article title was modified as follows: "Medullary Thyroid Carcinoma with double negative calcitonin and CEA: A case report and update of literature review"

3. When reporting the lab values replace commas with decimals.

According to the Reviewer suggestion the commas were replaced by decimals in laboratory values

4. The patient underwent 99Tc whole boy scan in Feb 2016. What was the purpose of doing this? It was already diagnosed MTC and not PTC. Kindly explain.

It was the attempt to precociously identify a possible recurrence, in a pathology not yet codified and of whom we don’t have a large experience. The text was modified as follows.
“Moreover, in February 2016, the patient underwent a 99Tc total body scintigraphy, in the attempt to precociously identify a possible recurrence, without showing area of abnormal accumulation.”

5. Kindly done use the same abbreviation for calcitonin and computed tomography. My suggestion is to keep calcitonin as such (no abbreviation) and use CT for computed tomography. Kindly modify accordingly.

According to the Reviewer suggestion for calcitonin no abbreviation was used, while CT was used for computed tomography

6. For the literature review merge all the three tables. The first table is redundant as all that information will be available in respected references.

According to the Reviewer suggestion the three tables were merged together in one table (table 1)

7. Remove figure 5. It adds no value to the article.

The figure 5 was removed from the paper

8. Merge the histopathology slides into two images. First one for initial diagnosis and second for recurrence. IHC for calcitonin and thyroglobulin is enough, no need to show for other markers in present context.

According to the Reviewer suggestion the histopathology slides were merged into 2 images

9. There is lot of repeat in the introduction and discussion parts. Remove these repetitions form discussion.

According to the Reviewer suggestion the repeated sentences were removed from the discussion section