

Dear Mr./Ms. Wang and reviewers,

Thank you very much for your reply. We have resolved all issues in the manuscript that are raised in the two peer-review reports. The requested responses to each point are as follow.

Reviewer #1:

1. Minor editing and language corrections are necessary.

The revised manuscript has been edited by a native English speaker at MedE Editing Group.

2. There is no running title.

Running title has been added.

3. There is no core tip in the manuscript file.

Core tip has been added.

4. Please add another keyword to be 6 in number as per journal style.

Another keyword "FISH" has been added.

5. Please add the objective of the study at the end of the introduction section.

The objective of our case report is to describe in detail an uncommon t(4;11) AML case, expecting to contribute to the further study of t(4;11) AML. It has been added at the end of the introduction section.

6. Case presentation

a. Please add the doses of these drugs (amlodipine and betaproc).

The doese of amlodipine and betaproc have been added.

b. A reference range for each laboratory test is required.

Reference ranges have been added for each laboratory test.

c. I understand that there is only figure 1 with 5 panels (a-e). Please unify the figure with what you mentioned in the text. Besides, panel d is not clear.

The issue has been settled. Each panel now is matched with the diagnostic test. We re-photographed the mitosis metaphase. For the chromosomes may be vague/misty when there is structural abnormality, the picture we provided is the clearest we can find.

7. It is illogical to see all the discussion in one paragraph.

The discussion has been divided into 3 paragraphs, which present background of MLL-r AML, analysis of the clinical and laboratory features, and the comparison with the existing data of MLL-r AML patients, respectively.

Reviewer #2:

1. Why you have included the methodology in the highlights of the article? (e.g: We report for the first time a 52-year-old.....) introducing age changes the substance of the article's highlights.

We have removed all the non-essential descriptions in the abstract, core tip, and conclusion.

2. In the introduction, how can reference number 10 appear before references 5,6,7,8,9? The references are arranged in order of appearance in the text from the introduction.

The sentence is “Conventional karyotype analysis and molecular genetic technology, fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) and reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) are the primary methods to detect MLL-r, used individually or in combination in previous studies^[3-10].” *References 3 to 10 (not 3 and 10)* are listed to explain the various methods used in others research, and references 4,5,6,7,8,9 are referenced in order of appearance in the later section. We also rechecked all the references to make sure they were correct.

3. In the History of present illness, please write correctly the words: day, month and week. otherwise it looks like laziness. And I think that 38°C is not a fever but a febrile.

All the day, week and month were corrected. Expressions of “fever” have been replaced by “febrility”.

4. In the History of past illness, please write “high blood pressure” but not hypertension

Expressions of “hypertension” has been replaced by “high blood pressure” in the history of past illness.

5. Write “Complete blood count revealed hyperleukocytosis...”

Expressions of “leukocytosis” has been replaced by “hyperleukocytosis”.

6. In the title, either add the word "literature review" or if you keep the same title, reduce the references because it is a lot of references for a case report.

We have added the word “and literature review” in the title.

7. In conclusion, there are several elements that should appear in your article: highlights(Core tip), authors and their affiliation, authors contribution, the institution that supported the research if any, conflict of interest statement, CARE checklist 2016 statement, corresponding author and so on.

Running title, core tip, authors and corresponding author informations, authors contribution, conflict of interest have been completed. The research has no institution supported.