

Dear prof. Lian-Sheng Ma and dear reviewers

Re: Manuscript ID: 67848 and Title: Successful treatment with erlotinib plus cabozantinib after Toxic epidermal necrolysis induced by AZD-9291 therapy in a patient with non-small cell lung cancer

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "67848" (ID). Those comments are valuable and very helpful. We have read through comments carefully and have made corrections. Based on the instructions provided in your letter, we uploaded the file of the revised manuscript. Revisions in the text are shown using red highlight for additions, and strikethrough font for deletions. The responses to the reviewer's comments are marked in red and presented following.

We would love to thank you for allowing us to resubmit a revised copy of the manuscript and we highly appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Huimin Zhang.

Reviewer #1:

Q1. Specific Comments to Authors: This is an instructing case report that TAGRISSO side effect was ameliorated by Erlotinib and cabozantinib. Though the

mechanistic basis will not be validated by this n=1 study, but the experience are very informative for the community. If the CT image at the day 74, when the side effects appeared, are available it would be helpful. Many people believe the patients having severe side effects usually have better tumor response to the drug. The legends about CT may be better using Day xx th instead of real May 29 or Aug 23. The explanations on Fig 2 A,B, C,D are not cited in the main text. What is the difference of A,C and B,D.

Response: We are grateful for the suggestion. We have added the information required as explained above (Lines 73-76, page 3). It is regrettable that the patient's fear of radiation from the CT examination at during drug eruption prevented us from obtaining the results of the CT examination.

Q2. LANGUAGE QUALITY: Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please. ...

Response: We apologize for the language problems in the original manuscript. The language presentation was improved with assistance from a native English speaker with appropriate research background.

Q3. *Science editor:* ...,

Response: We agree with the comment and revised the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions.

Q4. Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before its final acceptance, the author(s) must provide the Signed Informed Consent Form(s) or Document(s). For example, authors from China should upload the Chinese version of the document, authors from Italy should upload the Italian version of the document, authors from Germany should upload the Deutsch version of the document, and authors from the United States and the United Kingdom should upload the English version of the document, etc. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, "Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...".

Response: We are grateful for the suggestion. The manuscript has been modified according to your requirement.

Q4. STEPS FOR SUBMITTING THE REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Response: We deeply appreciate the reviewer's suggestion. The STEPS FOR SUBMITTING has been modified according to your requirement in revised manuscript.