

Corresponding responses to the comments

Thank you for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Mucoepidermoid carcinoma of the lung with haemoptysis as the initial symptom: A case report" (ID: 86280). These comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have studied these comments carefully and have made corrections that we hope will be met with approval. The main corrections in the paper and the responses to the reviewer's comments are as follows: Responses to the reviewer's comments:

1. Response to comment: Abstract should be concise - The term "mucus epidermoid carcinoma" should be replaced by mucoepidermoid carcinoma. Language and grammar revision is essential.

Response: thank you very much for the reviewer for this helpful suggestion. We have made changes in accordance with your comments.

2. Response to comment: Introduction section doesn't contain any cited source?! Also lacking important information introducing the case and its importance to be reported.

Response: We thank the reviewer for pointing out this issue. We give the source of the quoted content. We present important information about the reported case and the importance of reporting the case.

3. Response to comment: D dimer test is not properly typed.

Response: We thank the reviewer for pointing out this issue. We have revised this in the manuscript.

4. Response to comment: I wonder if you asked for any tumor markers?

Response: We thank the reviewer for pointing out this issue. The cases we have reported have only perfected tumor markers in the lungs, so we only know that tumor markers in the lungs are normal.

5. Response to comment: In discussion, you should discuss the different rare tumors came with unusual presentations; examples should be provided: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eucr.2020.101367> & <https://doi.org/10.7497%2Fj.issn.2095-3941.2014.03.007>

Response: We thank the reviewer for pointing out this issue. We made changes as you suggested, adding a description of the symptoms in paragraph 7 of the discussion section.

6. Response to comment: You should discuss the mucoepidermoid carcinoma in salivary gland and in lung, is there any morphologic or genetic relations.

Response: We thank the reviewer for pointing out this issue. We have made changes according to your suggestion and added the relevant discussion in paragraph 7 of the discussion section.

