

- The sample size is too small, as the authors declare and this could be a great limitation for the scientific value of the research. Illustrations and Tables are appropriate and of good quality. The statistical research is poor. References are up to date. The manuscript is concisely and coherently organized. Style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriate. The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics. Major revision

Answer to Reviewer #1:

1. Adding two references: "MRI of anal canal: common anal and perianal disorders beyond fistulas: Part 2. Erden A. Abdomen Radiol (NY) 2018; 43(6):1353-1367" and "MRI evaluation of anal and perianal diseases. Balci S, et al. Diagnost Interv Radiol 2019; 25(1): 21–27".

2. • A long-term follow-up could be useful to detect if "the fistula showed usually antedate the carcinoma by at least 10 years" and this could make the study stronger.

We deleted the content of perturbation of surgery as a risk factor for the malignant transformation of fistulas because of lack of sufficient theoretical support.

3. • A long-term follow-up could be useful to detect if "the fistula showed usually antedate the carcinoma by at least 10 years" and this could make the study stronger.

This is a retrospective study. Unfortunately, we lack follow-up data. This will be our next research direction.

4. • The sample size is too small, as the authors declare and this could be a great limitation for the scientific value of the research.

Although the number of cases was inadequate owing to the rarity of the disease, we believed that several characteristic MRI findings could contribute to accurate and timely diagnosis of carcinoma arising from anal fistula. Next we will expand our sample size for further research.

Answer to Science Editor:

1. reviewers should be answered

Reviewers question has been answered.

2. I have changed the manuscript type "case report" to "retrospective study", the authors need to revise the manuscript according to the Guidelines and Requirements for "retrospective study". The authors need to provide the Biostatistics Review Certificate and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form.

Biostatistics Review Certificate and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form have been submitted.

3. I found no "Author contribution" section. Please provide the author contributions;

The "Author contribution" has been added.

4. I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

Uploading the "PowerPoint" file.

5. I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references.

Reference list Has been modified.

6. I found the authors did not write the "article highlight" section. Please write the "article highlights" section at the end of the main text.

The "article highlight" has been added.