SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JCTI_27384**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Collision tumor at the gastroesophageal junction; coexistence of basaloid squamous cell carcinoma and small cell neuroendocrine carcinoma**
Type of the Article	**Case study**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	Unless there is a limitation of figures, the following presentations of the histological pictures are suggested, in my opinion. 1. The original figure 5 is put at the end of this sentence (lines 46-47): "Two different neighboring tumor foci were seen on histopathological examination (Figure 2)." i.e. the original figure 5 becomes figure 2. 2. (lines 47-49) In one of the tumor foci, a field, which had a narrow cytoplasm, cells with hyperchromatic nuclei, demonstrating a solid growing pattern, included focal necrosis fields, was observed (Figure 3). i.e. the original figure 2 becomes figure 3. 3. (lines 49-52) Another tumor focus, which had a narrow cytoplasm, hyperchromatic nucleus, displaying high mitotic activity and high-grade small cell NEC properties and the nucleoli of which could not be differentiated, was also observed next to the first tumor field (Figure 4). i.e. the original figure 3 becomes figure 4. 4. There should be a panel of immunohistochemical pictures for the sentence (lines 53-54): "On immunohistochemical examination, positive staining was seen with CK, CK19, and EMA at the BSC focus (Figure 5A-D)" 5. There should also be a panel of immunohistochemical pictures for the sentence (lines 54-55): "Positive staining was observed with CD56; chromogranin A; and CK, CK19, and EMA in neoplastic cells at the small cell NEC focus (Figure 6A-E)." 6. For high grade malignancy, it is unusual that the staining score of Ki67 was found to be only "2 %" (line 56). Is it any typo error or the author should submitted the histological picture for verification?	1.Figure 5 was became figure 2. 2. Figure 2 was became figure 3. 3. Figure 3 was became figure 4. figure 4 was became figure 5. 4. According to guideline of journal, Presentation of Case should not exceed 5 figures. Because We have 5 figures, We don't add immunohistochemical pictures (Presentation of Case, Discussion and Conclusion. Only Case Reports have word limits: Papers should not exceed 2000 words, 20 references or 5 figures). 5. According to guideline of journal, Presentation of Case should not exceed 5 figures. Because We have 5 figures, We don't add immunohistochemical pictures 6. There is a error, 2 % should be 22 %
Minor REVISION comments	1. Or, the authors just combine the histological pictures in three: Figure 2 is for H&E stainings for both foci; Figure 3A-D is for immunohistochemical stainings for BSC focus; whilst, Figure 4A-E is for immunohistochemical stainings for NEC focus.	1."for both BSC and NEC foci" was added to a sentence.

	This sentence (lines 56-57): "The mitotic index was evaluated to be higher than 25 in 10 high power fields" is suggested to be moved to the end of line 52 and to be modified as "the mitotic index was evaluated to be higher than 25 in 10 high power fields for both BSC and NEC foci". 2. It is suggested to avoid using the abbreviations of BSC and NEC in the figure legends.	2. Figure legends removed the abbreviations
Optional/General comments	This is an interesting and well-written case report and would add knowledge to the existing literature. To my knowledge, a more comprehensively presentation of the histological pictures, especially the immunohistochemical stainings, would be recommended.	