

Dear editor:

We sincerely thank the editor and all reviewers for their valuable feedback that we have used to improve the quality of our manuscript. The reviewer comments are laid out below and specific concerns have been numbered. Our response is given and changes/additions to the manuscript are given in the blue text.

To reviewer #1:

1.Title. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript.

Reply: Thank you for your approval.

2.Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript.

Reply: Thank you for your approval.

3.Key Words. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript, but what does “physical factors” mean?

Reply: Thank you for your suggestion, “Physical factors” refers to physical factor therapy in this manuscript. To avoid ambiguity, we have removed this keyword.

4.Background. The manuscript satisfactorily describes the background, present status and significance of the study.

Reply: Thank you for your approval.

5.Methods. The manuscript does not have this section.

Reply: As this manuscript is a case report, there is no method involved.

6.Results. What is the cause of death?

Reply: According to your suggestion, we have added the following causes of death to the manuscript: The cause of death is the recurrence of tumor.

7.Discussion. (1) What does it mean by “physical factors should be used” in the Abstract?

Reply: According to your suggestion, we have modified “physical factors should be used” to “physical factor therapy should be used” in this abstract.

(2) A suggestion is “pathological examination should be performed for refractory ulcers of the scalp”; why not refractory ulcers of other part of the skin?

Reply: According to your suggestion, we have added the suggested content to the manuscript: pathological examination should be performed for refractory ulcers in any part of the skin.

(3) How was the suggestion “physical factors should be used with caution before the diagnosis is clear” reached? Delay in proper treatment or something else? Please clarify.

Reply: According to your suggestion, we have added the reason in this manuscript: because this may delay the correct treatment plan.

8.Illustrations and tables. The quality of figures is satisfactory.

Reply: Thank you for your approval.

9.Biostatistics. The manuscript did not use statistical methods.

Reply: Thank you for your approval. The manuscript did not use statistical methods.

10.Units. The manuscript meets the requirements of use of SI units, but the description “neutrophil percentage: 0.78 (reference value: 0.20-0.75)” is not appropriate.

Reply: According to your suggestion, we have met the expression “neutrophil percentage” with SI units, “neutrophil percentage: 78% (reference value: 20%-75%).”

11.References. The use of references is satisfactory.

Reply: Thank you for your approval.

12. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The organization and presentation of the manuscript is satisfactory but the section 2. Consent for publication can be placed together with other ethical statements.

Reply: According to your suggestion, we have put our consent together with other ethical statements.

13. Research methods and reporting. Authors have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG's standards for manuscript type.

Reply: Thank you for your approval.

14. Ethics statements. The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics, but the statement "the Department of Ethics Committee of the First Hospital of Jilin University approved the study" should not be in a different font or in red. By the way, "Department of Ethics Committee" is weird; please confirm.

Reply: According to your suggestion, We have modified different fonts and colors to the same font and color. And change the name to "Ethics Committee of the First Hospital of Jilin University"

To reviewer #2:

**Specific Comments to Authors:** the authors presented a rare case under difficult conditions. Although, the manuscript is good, the following points should be taken into consideration:

1. It is not clear if the malignancy presented in this study came before the injury, or after it. - Parts of the discussion part should be in the introduction.

Reply: According to your suggestion, We have put the parts of the discussion part should be in the introduction. This section includes: Angiosarcoma is difficult to diagnose at an early stage, and treatment of the condition is often delayed by mistakenly attributing it to trauma-related abrasions and abscesses. Imaging examinations such as CT or MRI have a certain value for understanding the location, extent of invasion and whether there is distant metastasis. Thus, timely local tissue biopsy is the main method of diagnosis.

2. Figures need to be more explainable through the use of arrows and comments.

Reply: According to your suggestion, we have added more explainable through the use of arrows and comments to the manuscript.

3. Some language issues have to be addressed.

Reply: According to your suggestion, We have conducted professional language polishing.

4. I suggest, but this is optional, to conduct a clinicopathological comparison between the perspectives of the lesion as inflammatory and malignancy.

Reply: Thank you for the reviewer for providing "optional" suggestions. We have not made a comparison due to the limitation of the length of the manuscript.

To reviewer #3:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

1. **Specific Comments to Authors:** Thank you for the possibility to review the manuscript titled: "Misdiagnosis of Scalp Angiosarcoma: a case report". The manuscript is interesting,

well-illustrated and easy to read. The main goals and ideas are presented in a clear fashion.

Reply: Thank you for your approval.

2. There are only one minor recommendation: -Please review the language of the manuscript, there are minor type errors in the text. The overall quality of the review is high.

Reply: According to your suggestion, We have conducted professional language polishing.

3. Please take into account the recommendations in the spirit of improving the quality of the submission.

Reply: Thank you for your suggestion, we will try to modify the manuscript one by one according to the reviewer's suggestion.

So sorry it is the first modification for us, even though we tried to modify the manuscript one by one according to the reviewer's suggestion, therefore it might be found some unsatisfied content. If there are any other modifications we could make, we would like very much to modify them. Really appreciate your help. Thank you very much again.