

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Femoral epithelioid hemangioendothelioma detected with MRI and PET/CT: case report & literature review". The comments are valuable and have helped improve the quality of our paper.

We have carefully reviewed the comments and have made necessary corrections to address the concerns. All changes in the revised manuscript are marked in red color. The main corrections in the paper and the responses to the individual comments of the reviewers are enclosed with this letter.

We hope that the revision is acceptable for the publication in your journal.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Hongguang Zhao

Responds to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Response:** Thank you for the careful review.

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Response:** Thank you for the careful review. We have made the corresponding modifications in the revised manuscript.

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Response:** Thank you for professional suggestion. We have followed your advice and have made corresponding modifications in the revised manuscript.

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Thank you for the good paper. However, epithelioid hemangioendothelioma is known to be difficult to diagnose only through imaging. If there are

gross findings of the lesion during surgery or those diagnosed with a pathological microscope, it would be better paper.

**Response:** Thank you for the insightful suggestion. This patient was operated in another hospital, so the gross specimen (the picture below) was also provided by the doctor from another hospital, but their surgeon did not agree to put this picture in the article. Therefore, we have included the histopathological images in the revised manuscript (Figure 3).



**(1) Science editor:**

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the femoral epithelioid hemangioendothelioma detected with MRI and PET/CT. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC.

(1) Classification: Grade B;

**Response:** Thank you for the careful review.

(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors reported the good paper. However, epithelioid hemangioendothelioma is known to be difficult to diagnose only through imaging. If there are gross findings of the lesion during surgery or those diagnosed with a pathological microscope;

**Response:** Thank you for professional suggestion. This patient was operated in another hospital, so the gross specimen (the picture below) was also provided by the doctor from another hospital, but their surgeon did not agree to put this picture in the article. Therefore, we have included the histopathological images in the revised manuscript (Figure 3).



and (3) Format: There are 2 figures. A total of 16 references are cited, including 6 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations.

**Response:** Thank you for the careful review.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by a professional medical editing company is provided.

**Response:** Thank you for the careful review.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the CARE Checklist–2016, the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, and the Written informed consent. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search.

**Response:** Thank you for the careful review.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC.

**Response:** Thank you.

5 Issues raised: (1) The authors did not provide original pictures. 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;

**Response:** We have followed your advice and have made the corresponding modifications in the revised manuscript.

and (2) The "Case Presentation" section was not written according to the Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation. Please re-write the "Case Presentation" section, and add the "FINAL DIAGNOSIS", "TREATMENT", and "OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP" sections to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision.

**Response:** Thank you for professional suggestion. We have followed your advice and have made the corresponding modifications in the revised manuscript.

6 Re-Review: Required.

**Response:** Thank you.

7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

**Response:** Thank you for the careful review.