

Dear Editor

We fully accept the opinions of the two reviewers and make corresponding modifications.

we have revised the article again by polishing the English language and typesetting it according to the requirements of the journal.

**Reviewer 1's comments :**

- 1) Abstract, Case presentation: "in a patient" -> "in the patient"
- 2) Introduction: "suitable for patients" -> "suitable for each patient"?
- 3) Figure 2G is an MR image.
- 4) When you say e.g. "2.49x3.24 cm in size", is that intended to be an area (cm<sup>2</sup>) or volume (cm<sup>3</sup>)?
- 5) Case presentation, second paragraph: "mass density" -> "density" (CT doesn't tell you the mass density); FDG SUV must be from PET, not MR; "could be detected" -> "were detected"? "puncture cell diagnosis" -> "needle biopsy"?
- 6) "CA199"->"CA19-9"
  - 7) "listed in table": please specify which table.
  - 8) "lost the best time" -> "missed the best time"
  - 9) "enhanced CT": do you mean "contrast-enhanced CT"? If yes, what contrast?
  - 10) Table 2 caption: "marker"->"markers"

**We have made the following targeted modifications**

1. "in a patient" Modify to "in the patient"
2. "suitable for patients" Modify to "suitable for each patient"
3. in Figure 2, Modify the expression to MR image (G) High-intensity images on T2-weighted images.
4. "2.49x3.24 cm in size" Modify to "2.49x3.24 cm<sup>2</sup> in size"
5. "mass density" Modify to "density". Adjust the position of MR result expression.  
"could be detected" Modify to "were detected". "puncture cell diagnosis" Modify to "needle biopsy".
6. "CA199" Modify to "CA19-9"

7. "listed in table" Modify to "listed in table 2"
8. "lost the best time" Modify to "missed the best time"
9. In order to observe the changes of tumor after treatment, we made enhanced CT
10. "marker" Modify to "markers"

**Reviewer 2's comments :**

Overall, the case report looks interesting and we come across a novel fusion. However, in terms of writing, the Discussion needs to be more robust and efforts should be made to check and include in the Discussion if more studies on this fusion exists in this site or in the other sites also.

**We have made the following targeted modifications**

ROS1-CENPW is a novel fusion gene locus in PACC that has not been previously reported. We search based on ROS1-CENPW as a keyword in PubMed( <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>) Reference Citation Analysis (RCA, <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>) MedlinePlus (<https://medlineplus.gov/> ). No relevant reports have been found regarding this rare fusion gene.