

## Author's Response

Dear Editor and Reviewer:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewer's comments concerning my manuscript entitled "A case of kidney inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor that was difficult to diagnose before surgery: A case report and literature review" (ID: 50838). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as flowing:

Responds to the reviewer's comments:

1. Response to comment: The authors should state how this case report adds in the existing literature.

Response: Thank you very much for your comment. We are very sorry for our negligence in the innovation of the article. Considering your suggestion, we analyzed the case in detail and corrected the following two points. 1. In the third paragraph of the discussion section, we focused on the analysis that renal calculus may be the cause of the cause. In the conclusion and core tip section, we highlighted that renal calculus were suspected one of the causes or drivers of IMT. 2. The form of malignant tumor with adrenal metastasis in computed tomography imaging was the characteristic of this case. The title has been changed into "Kidney inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor masquerading as metastatic malignancy: A case report and literature review". The subtitle has been changed into "Kidney inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor masquerading as metastatic malignancy". We should be aware of these manifestations of IMT in order to provide patients with better treatments in clinical practice. We suggest that the presence of IMTs in the kidney should be considered in the diagnosis of renal malignancy.

2. Response to comment: Some editing comments - Surgical margins were negative.

Response: Thank you very much for your suggestion. The sentence of "Surgical margins were negative" has been corrected to the sentence of "The surgical margins were negative".

3. Response to comment: Please rephrase - UPJ: uretero pelvic junction UPJ:uretero pelvic

junction.

Response: Thank you very much for your correction. We are very sorry for our careless mistakes. UPJ has been rephrased as uretero pelvic junction.

Responds to the editor's comments:

Response to comment: I suggest to delete those 3 words from the title.

Response: Thank you very much for your suggestion. Those 3 words in the title have been deleted.

Responds to the editor's comments: Please provide and upload the approved grant application form(s).

Response: Thank you very much for your comment. We have uploaded relevant documents as required.

Responds to the editor's comments: Would you like to provide those figures in color?

Response: Thank you very much for your suggestion. The gray figures have been changed into color figures.

Other changes:

1. The editing of "kidney lithiasis" were corrected as "renal calculus" throughout the whole article.
2. A keyword "hematuria" was changed to "renal calculus".

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. We appreciate for Editor/Reviewer' warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Yours sincerely,  
Qing Wang