Dear editors,

Thank you for your response regarding our manuscript entitled "Central pontine myelinolysis mimicking glioma in diabetes: a case report". We are grateful for the critical comments and thoughtful suggestions provided by the editors and reviewers. Based on these comments and suggestions, we have made careful modifications to the original manuscript, and have included point-by-point responses to the reviewers and editors' comments and questions below. The revised content has been marked in red. In addition, we have carefully rechecked our manuscript to improve language fluency and proficiency.

We would like to resubmit the manuscript for your consideration. We believe the insightful comments from the reviewers and editors have helped us produce a better paper. And we hope the revised manuscript will adhere to the standard of your excellent and highly respected journal. Thanks again for your consideration of our manuscript for publication in your journal. We await your reply at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Jin-Xia Zhang

Department of Clinical Psychology (Sleep Medical Center), Hangzhou TCM Hospital Affiliated to Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou 310000, Zhejiang Province, China;

E-mail: zhangjinxia20000@163.com;

Tel/Fax: 86-15867104765

Round-1:

Reply to the comments from Reviewer #1:

Thanks for your critical comments and thoughtful suggestions on our manuscript. We have seriously considered your comments and answered as below:

General comment: *Please, organize the manuscript according to the "Guidelines for manuscript preparation, submission, and manuscript format: Case report" proposed by "World Journal of Clinical Cases" .*

Answer: Thanks for your critical and thoughtful comments on our manuscript. We have checked our manuscript according to the guidelines by the journal.

Specific comments: about the languages

Answer: We regret for our language problems. We greatly appreciate your suggestions. We have rechecked our manuscript to improve language fluency and proficiency. The mistakes have been corrected and unified in the revised manuscript.

Specially, the sentence of "The blood The electrolyte, blood routine, hepatorenal functions were in a normal range generally." has been revised as "His complete blood count, serum electrolytes, renal and liver function parameters were within the normal range.", as showed in the Page 2, line 8-10 in the revised manuscript.

And the sentence of "In time of the extremely rapid correction of hyponatremia, the extracellular toxicity increased quickly without promptly adjustment of intracellular osmoles" has been revised as "With the too rapid correction of the hyponatremia with intravenous fluids, the extracellular tonicity increased dramatically while the intracellular osmoles failed to changed in time, the water was then driven out of the brain cell.", as showed in the Page 3, line 9-12.

The word "autopsy" in the sentence of "Though without autopsy results, the positive

therapeutic response as well as the features of imaging features dragged out our diagnostic direction of glioma" was changed into "biopsy" for better understanding.

Comment: *Please, add in this section table with summarized similar cases published in the literature (some of them were already cited in the literature of manuscript) with demographic, laboratory, clinical and imaging data and describe briefly the most important results. Although there are not enough patients to draw conclusions based on statistical significance, try to point out some facts that could be of clinical significance.*

Answer: Thank you for your critical comments and we totally agree with your suggestions which might be of great help to improve the quality of our manuscript. We have added the details from the previous mainly similar cases, including the demographic, laboratory, clinical and imaging data. In consideration of the rare cases, we wold like to summarize and describe directly by words rather than table, as showed in the first paragraph of Discussion and conclusions.

Reply to the comments from Reviewer #2:

Thanks very much for your kind work and consideration on acceptance and publication of our paper. On behalf of my co-authors, we would like to express our great appreciation to editor and reviewers.

Round-2:

Dear reviewer:

Thanks for your critical comments and thoughtful suggestions on our manuscript. We have seriously considered your comments and answered as below:

minor corrections: 1.Page 10, line 9 – “For instance, a 20-year-old type 1 diabetes female was reported acute onset spastic quadriparesis with dysarthria and mild ataxia [6].” – please rewrite this sentence as follows “For instance, a 20-year-old type 1 diabetes female was reported with acute onset of spastic quadriparesis with dysarthria and mild ataxia [6].” 2.Page 10, line 10 – “A 45-year-old woman…” - please, start the sentence as follows: “Also, a 45-year-old woman presented to…” 3.Page 10, line 12 – “And a 45-year-old male with past medical history of type 2 diabetes, hypertension…” please, start the sentence as follows: “Likewise, a 45-year-old male with past medical history of type 2 diabetes, hypertension…”

Answer: Thanks for your critical and thoughtful comments on our manuscript. We regret for our language problems. We greatly appreciate your suggestions. We have rechecked our manuscript to improve language fluency and proficiency. The mistakes have been corrected and unified in the revised manuscript.