

## **Response to reviewers**

**Journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Title:** "Endometrial squamous cell carcinoma originating from the cervix: A case report and literature review"

**Manuscript number:** 76916

**Dear editors:**

Thank you very much for all of your suggestions and comments. We have carefully revised the manuscript accordingly and made some other changes for improvement as well. The responses are presented down below in order, and we hope it will meet the standards for further acceptance and publication.

Reviewer 1

1. In the text soma (some?) words are not spaced.
2. Pay attention. IMAGING EXAMINATIONS - "Enhanced pelvic magnetic resonance imaging conforme the findings, suggesting pyo,etra (fig 1) and possibly endometrial polyp or submucosal myoma." The Authors should add an MR image with the possibly endometrial polyp or submucosal myoma.
3. DISCUSSION - The discussion is absolutely well written, however it seems a review or a chapter of a book rather than a compared evaluation of the present case report with the data of the literature. The Authors should correlate what they reported in the discussion with the peculiar aspect of the present case report.
4. FIGURES - The Authors have to add the arrows on each figure.

Answers:

1. Again, we've carefully checked all the spellings in the manuscript, and send it for another professional editing to ensure that such mistakes won't happen again.
2. We have added another MRI image in Figure 1 with the possible endometrial polyp, in order to better present the condition inside the uterus.

3. In order to present a thorough understanding of this unique disease, the discussion part was initially written mainly in a narrative perspective to introduce the history, classification and potential mechanisms of this disease. However, after reading the suggestions provided by the reviewers, we also felt the need to compare more between our cases and the other recent and similar cases, so the second paragraph in the discussion part was greatly remodified to discuss the similarities between cases and trying to figure out the general patterns behind it. Also, the last 2 paragraphs of the discussion section was also revised to further investigate the approaches for early diagnosis and prevention for this disease.
4. We've added arrows on each figure to better illustrate the pathological changes of this disease.

#### Reviewer 2

1. What are the new hypotheses that this study proposed?
2. What are the key problems in this field that this study has solved?
3. How might this publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice?

#### Answers:

Thanks again for these valuable questions, we reconsidered these questions carefully and revised in our manuscript accordingly. The key points of this case is to stress the rareness of this disease as well as sharing the commonness of the published cases, so as to raise awareness of the gynecologists when facing a similar situation, we proposed the hypotheses that an advanced age, cervical stenosis and pyometra would interact together leading to the progression of this disease as well as explained the possible mechanisms from our point of view. Furthermore, along with other scholars, we also put emphasis on the early detection and prevention of this unique tumor, but for the first time, we mentioned that although a thorough evaluation (including an endometrial biopsy) was performed, there could still be an upgrade in the final diagnosis, which calls for more careful and comprehensive measurements in the future. We hope our case would draw

more global attention over studying the mechanisms of this cephalad spreading pattern of this disease as well as the promoting relevant guidelines in the future.

Company editor-in-chief:

1. 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: ...” . Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.
2. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is ‘original’ , the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022.
3. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA.

Answers:

1. We’ve re-organized all the figures carefully with arrows in the PPT and submit as an attachment, in order to fulfill the need for further reprocessing.
2. All the figures in this manuscript were provided by our whole team, thus, they were considered our original copyright, so we’ve add the “Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022” as requested.
3. RCA was used in order to search for the latest literatures, and some were added in our manuscript, meanwhile, we are very amazed by the function of this search engine and will definitely use it more often in the future.

Again we are very grateful for all of your considerations, and we are looking forward for your reply.

Sincerely, yours

Xin-Yu Shu