

List of Responses

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Successful treatment of solitary bladder plasmacytoma: A case report and review of literature". 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. The responds to the reviewer's comments are as flowing:

Responds to the peer-reviewer's comments:

Reviewer's code: 04070439

1. Response to comment:

I recommend that it should be revised taking into account the minor changes requested.

Response: We downed the attached file written by the peer-reviewer and accept these minor changes. Now, We have upload the changed manuscript.

2. Response to comment:

Please, remove hyperlinks (Case presentation, Further diagnosis and treatment, Outcome and follow-up, and Table 1).

Response: We have remove hyperlinks of the manuscript.

Reviewer's code: 00503929

1. Response to comment:

what are the original findings of this manuscript? What are the new hypotheses that this study proposed?

Response: The study describes a case of solitary intramedullary plasmacytoma in 51-old female, that was successfully treated by surgery followed by radiotherapy. And I am sorry that the study proposes no new hypothesis, except that surgery may be very important as a complementary approach to radiotherapy.

2. Response to comment:

What are the new phenomena that were found through experiments in this study? What are the hypotheses that were confirmed through experiments in this study?

Response: The study describes no novel phenomena since the

properties of the tumor and the therapeutic response were in agreement with data from the existing literature on this rare tumor type. And I am so sorry that the study does not confirm any hypothesis, since no experiments were carried out in the study.

3. Response to comment:

What are the quality and importance of this manuscript? What are the new findings of this study?

Response: This is a very well-organized, well-written, manuscript, with appropriate supporting images. The characterization of the tumor as a monoclonal population is appropriate. And the study proposes that surgery may be very important in the management of this disease, alongside radiotherapy.

4. Response to comment:

What are the new concepts that this study proposes? What are the new methods that this study proposed?

Response: I am so sorry that the study proposes no new methods since immunochemical and imaging approaches were used, as in previous studies by others.

5. Response to comment:

Do the conclusions appropriately summarize the data that this study provided? What are the unique insights that this study presented?

Response: The conclusions correspond strictly to the data, which are very clear. And I am so sorry that the study offers no unique insights, other than the effectiveness of the chosen treatment in this case

6. Response to comment:

What are the key problems in this field that this study has solved?

Response: The study has not solved any key issues in the field, but it has substantially enriched the literature on this rare disease with an example of successful management.

7. Response to comment:

What are the limitations of the study and its findings?

Response: We have found no limitations in the study, which is an adequate and useful case report of a rare disease and has sampled the previously existing reports for comparison.

8. Response to comment:

What are the future directions of the topic described in this manuscript?

Response: I am sorry there are no future directions to suggest, since the continuation of this study will require follow-up of this patient, as well as the appearance of novel cases.

9. Response to comment:

What are the questions/issues that remain to be solved?

Response: The real question is whether a beneficial effect of surgery associated with radiotherapy will be observed in further, comparable cases.

10. Response to comment:

The authors should follow this patient up and report at a significantly later date whether she remains disease-free.

Response: We will follow the patient up and report whether she keeps the disease away.

11. Response to comment:

How might this publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice?

Response: This publication is a significant contribution to both basic science and clinical practice, by adding to the store of knowledge concerning a very rare condition.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript according to the peer-reviewer's suggestion.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

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