

May 9, 2013

Dear Editor,

We are grateful to the Reviewers and the Editor for their very thoughtful and constructive comments on our manuscript. We have now amended the manuscript in response to the comments and would like to submit this revised manuscript for your consideration. The following is our point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments. Please find enclosed the edited manuscript (a clean version and one with changes highlighted) as an attached copies of the full text manuscript in Word format.

Title: Hepatic adenoma mimicking a metastatic lesion on CT-PET scan

Authors: Darryl Lim, Ser Yee Lee, Kiat Hon Lim, Chung Yip Chan

ESPS Manuscript No: 3008

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1. Format has been updated

2. Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer. Changes are highlighted in yellow in the manuscript. Another clean manuscript without the highlights is also included.

a. **Reviewer's comments:** (1) Cross-sectional image of the PET and histological slide of the hepatic adenoma have been provided (Figure 1 and Figure 2). If possible, please provide the image of surveillance CT scan and gross appearance.

a. **Authors' Reply:** Cross-sectional image of the surveillance CT scan has been added (Figure 1). We were also asked to provide a picture of the gross appearance of the specimen. However, we apologize that we are unable to provide any good pictures of the gross specimen as our pathology department do not routinely photograph specimens unfortunately. We apologise for that.

b. **Reviewer's comments:** (2) Six reports have been published in the English literature documenting PET-avid hepatocellular adenomas. In the DISCUSSION section, please compare these 6 cases with yours.

b. **Authors' Reply:** We have made a comparison of the previous 7 reports published in the literature with our case and included our comments in the discussion. During the revision of the manuscript a recent report was published that was not included in our initial draft. We have included this recent case report to be comprehensive and current and have revised it as shown in our latest manuscript.

c. **Reviewer's comments:** (3) False-positive results have generally been described in hepatic abscesses. Please discuss the differences of false-positive results between hepatic adenoma and abscesses on the PET.

c. **Authors' Reply:** Unfortunately, due to the limitations of CT/PET, it is not possible to distinguish a PET-avid hepatic adenoma from a liver abscess solely from its features on

CT/PET as an imaging modality. Other information is required to make a distinction, such as clinical history and laboratory investigations. For example, patients with liver abscess may have signs and symptoms of infection such as fever/chills and pain; liver function test may be mildly abnormal with leukocytosis and inflammatory makers such as C-reactive protein (CRP) and erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) may be elevated. Patients with hepatic adenoma will not have such signs/symptoms of infection but may have a history of oral contraceptive usage and tend to be females in the reproductive age group. There is no evidence in the literature as well that CT/PET alone can distinguish PET-avid hepatic adenoma from a liver abscess/tuberculoma.

d. **Reviewer's comments:** (4) The language: minor revision.

d. **Authors' Reply:** Revisions have been made to the language, grammar and syntax of the article.

3. References, typesetting were revised and corrected.

Thank you again for the consideration on publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely Yours,

Dr Darryl Lim, Dr. Ser Yee Lee

Department of General Surgery, Singapore General Hospital

Singapore Health Services Pte Ltd, Outram Road Singapore 168751, Republic of Singapore

Email: darryl.lmj@gmail.com, seryee@yahoo.com

Tel: +65-81132178