

Dear reviewers,

Thanks all of you for your carefully and timely review of our manuscript. After reading the "Review Report", we made the modifications as follow:

The first two reviewers have no particular comment on the paper, and needn't do any revision. we accept it very gratefully.

The third reviewer provides some valuable suggestions, we appreciate the reviewer's insightful comment, and we response as follow:

Comment 1: Language quality: A great deal of language polishing.

Response: We have embellished the language of the full text and highlighted in the update version of the manuscript. (Due to too many details have been modified, so we didn't cited in this letter).

Comment 2: Patient identity should not be revealed.

Response: "Patient Wang, a 36-year-old male" has been modified as "The patient was a 36-year-old male".

Comment 3: Patients had been treated at various centers with patchy information available in this report e.g. patient was treated initially as a case of pancreatitis though serum amylase was less than three times raised. Similarly, details of lab parameters are not mentioned elsewhere also (page 1 last para).

Response: "Multiple laboratory tests at other hospitals indicated elevated levels of pancreatic enzymes (less than 3-fold of the upper limit of the normal range) combined with gallstones" has been modified as "When reviewed the patient's past medical records, multiple laboratory tests at other hospitals indicated elevated levels of pancreatic enzymes ranging from 213-341 IU/L(less than 3-fold of the upper limit of the normal range [35-140 IU/L]) combined with slight exudation around the pancreas and gallstones"

Comment 4: How was the pancreatic biopsy taken: was it trucut or open.

Response: "a biopsy of the hypoechoic area of the pancreatic tail was further conducted under ultrasound guidance" has been modified as "percutaneous needle aspiration biopsy of the hypoechoic area of the pancreatic tail was conducted under ultrasonography guidance".

Comment 5: What was the chemotherapy /RT regimen used?

Response: "An AML-related chemotherapy regimen was initiated in December; Radiochemotherapy was then given" has been modified as "An IDA chemotherapy regimen was initiated in December. Radiochemotherapy (the lesion in the pancreatic tail, 24Gy/12F) was then given". And "chemotherapy was continued(last para of 'CASE REPORT ')" has been modified as "switch to DAC (decitabine)+CAG chemotherapy regimen".

Comment 6: Please use standard terminology e.g. contrast enhanced CT scan instead of enhanced CT scan, Endoscopic ultrasound instead of ultrasound gastroscope.

Response: All of the unstandard terminology has been normalized in the paper and highlighted.

The last reviewer suggests that “ Can the authors please upload the pictures of the positive immunohistochemistry slides of the myeloid sarcoma” ,and we response as follow:

Response:The pictures of the positive immunohistochemistry slides of the myeloid sarcoma have been uploaded in the penultimate page(Figure 2).But the immunohistochemical staining of p53 has not been uploaded because of poor quality.

After checking the update paper, please inform us if have any shortcomings, we will modify it as soon as possible. Thanks a lot.

Dear editor,

Thank you very much for your work. The revision paper we have already received and modified it according to “the editor’s suggestions” and the “Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision: Case Report”. We made the modifications as follow:

1. The authors’s name: ”Ting Zhu, XuYan Xi, HongJuan Dong” be revised as “Ting Zhu, Xu-Yan Xi, Hong-Juan Dong”.

2. Author contributions: Zhu T participated in the design of the report, analysed the data and wrote the paper; Xi XY collected the medical imaging materials; Dong HJ designed the report and performed the preliminary revision of the article.

3. Added some contents according to the “Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision: Case Report”: Informed consent statement, CARE Checklist(2013) statement, Open-Access and the progress of the article. All of these have been highlighted in the updated version.

4. The article highlight section has been completed and been highlighted.

After checking the update paper, please inform us if have any shortcomings, we will modify it as soon as possible. Thanks a lot.