

Dear Editor,

Re-“Collision tumor of squamous cell carcinoma and neuroendocrine carcinoma in the head and neck: A case report and literature review”

Manuscript NO: 52613

Thank you for reviewing the above-referenced manuscript submitted earlier to your office. We have to admit that there were a number of mistakes and incorrect descriptions in our previous manuscript and figures. We would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to you and the reviewers. In accordance with the Reviewers' comments and suggestions, the manuscript has been revised accordingly. Besides, we have fixed some typos and grammatical errors. We feel that this revised manuscript has been strengthened by the Reviewers' comments and suggestions. A point-by-point response to Reviewers' comments and suggestions has been prepared and followed this cover letter.

I hope these changes and explanations satisfy the requirements of the Editorial Board. I thank you again for reviewing the manuscript and look forward to hearing your favorable reply soon.

Yours sincerely,

Baozhu Zhang, PhD.

Department of Oncology, The People's Hospital of Baoan Shenzhen, The Affiliated Baoan Hospital of Southern Medical University, Longjing Road 118#, Bao'an District, Shenzhen City, Guangdong Province, 518100, China. Tel: +86-755-27788311. E-mail: 476149881@qq.com,

A point-by-point response to Reviewers and editor's comments and suggestions

Reviewer #1 (Comments to the Author (Required)):

1. The major concern is that, to my opinion, the proof of collision tumor of SCC and NEC would not be strong enough. To my view, the diagnosis of NEC is adequate but that of SCC is inadequate; the authors need to show the typical/obvious squamous differentiation area of the neoplasm. Furthermore, for squamous differentiation, the CK5/6 would need to show diffuse positive.

Our Reply: It is very nice of your kind advice. In the new Figure 1A, typical/obvious squamous differentiation area of the neoplasm was showed. Furthermore, CK5/6 expression was checked with the same tissue. Result showed that CK5/6 is

diffuse positive for squamous differentiation (Figure1B).

2. The title would need to be modified as “Collision tumor of squamous cell carcinoma and small cell carcinoma in the head and neck: A case report and literature review”.

Our Reply: Thank you for your correction. According to your suggestion, the title has been modified as “Collision tumor of squamous cell carcinoma and neuroendocrine carcinoma in the head and neck: A case report and literature review”.

3. Some citations would also need to be included in the Introduction section.

Our Reply: We have to admit that it is our carelessness. Relevant citations have been put in the Introduction section properly. Thank you again for your kindness.

Reviewer #2(Comments to the Author (Required)):

1. 'Ethics' section should be made as another different one. In this manuscript, authors described ethical issues in the 'Imaging examinations' section.

Our Reply: Please let us express our appreciation for your careful review. We have transferred the ethical issues from the 'Imaging examinations' section to the title page. (Please see the last two lines of the title page)