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Author’s response to reviews:

1. Types and mechanism of intervention
Response: Surgical resection plus adjuvant chemotherapy.

2. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits
Response: After recovery, the patient agreed to four courses intraperitoneal infusion chemotherapy. At fifteen months after surgery, the patient is in good condition and is being followed up.

3. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?
Response: Yes

4. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
Response: Yes

5. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
Response: Yes, I think so.

6. Did you perform an adequate colectomy? Did the patient receive an adjuvant therapy? Follow-up proposed? Pseudomyxoma peritonei was excluded? HIPEC could be proposed?
Response: Please refer to the case presentation and discussion in the new submission manuscript.

7. Did you cause any leakage or rupture of the tumor during the surgery? Was your patient positive for peritoneal carcinomatosis?
Response: The mass was resected completely without any leakage or rupture. The final pathology report revealed a well-differentiated appendiceal mucinous adenocarcinoma with mucin infiltration into the soft tissue of the lump edge, and omentum tissue was infiltrated by mucinous nodules.

8. Did you perform a frozen biopsy as a rapid pathological examination?
Response: Yes

All revisions are presented in the new submission manuscript.