

Re: Manuscript 51422

Dear reviewers,

Many thanks for taking the time out of your busy schedule to review our manuscript. I appreciate given your likely work demands, it is not always easy to make time to review. We are grateful for your thoughts.

**Reviewer A**

"The case report is structured such that giant cell tumor of bone dominates the introduction and discussion, despite the tumor ultimately being diagnosed as an ABC. ABCs are not rare tumors in patients under 20 years of age, and 12% of ABCs occur in the pelvis. The MRI images are of poor quality. Were there multiple fluid-fluid levels? The introduction and discussion should be re-written to better discuss the differential diagnosis of this lesions and the overlapping and differentiating features between GCT and ABC. More also needs to be written regarding the histopathological differentiation of these entities (which isn't always straightforward) and which special stains may help."

Thanks for your kind review. We have taken your constructive criticism and modified our manuscript to include an improved introduction and discussion we hope. We have also replaced "rare" with "less common" when referring to ABCs secondary to your helpful comments. We apologise for the quality of the MRI. The radiologist did not report fluid levels and it is difficult to deduce from the images. We have also added more information in relation to the histopathological differentiation following your kind review.

Many thanks.

**Reviewer B**

An interesting case: i) Authors could give more information about operative bleeding. ii) The title has humour but it does not appropriately reflect the case.

Thank you for your kind review. We have added information in relation to operative bleeding and also modified our title following your helpful comments. Again, many thanks.