

## Dear Reviewer,

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 61842

**Title:** Giant androgen-producing adrenocortical carcinoma with atrial flutter: case report and literature review

The paper is interesting but the topic of adrenocortical carcinoma is far from unique as demonstrated by the countless references.

If atrial flutter is the unique ingredient, the paper presents little discussion of this topic, no EKG for verification of the arrhythmia and the bulk of the cardiological references concern atrial fibrillation, a somewhat different disorder.

➤ Done

To warrant publication, the paper needs to be rewritten addressing the following concerns: The abstract is far too long and includes information better suited to "discussion." It should be composed of one sentence describing the condition and a longer statement about its usual connection to arrhythmia.

➤ Done

A final sentence would state "this study presents the case of a middle aged woman who developed a very large adrenocortical carcinoma complicated by atrial flutter and congestive heart failure."

➤ Done

The introduction as written would make an excellent discussion and should be used in that section.

➤ Done

There really needs to be no introduction--it could launch immediately into the case report. Particularly if the arrhythmia is the unique issue, the case report should give more information about the heart. A "decreased murmur at the left base" is not an acceptable cardiological description. An EKG should be included in the figures.

➤ Done

A short explanation of the endocrine and liver failure issues could be considered together. Discussion on all of page 18 regarding arrhythmia is all about Atrial Fibrillation except lines 11 and 12 .There should be a reference for this assumption. Page 21, lines 5 and beyond belongs in a method section.

➤ Done

Generally the paper is too long for a single case. There is a good deal of repetition that could be eliminated and there is duplication of data in tables.

The tables are better.

➤ Thank you.

Finally there may be too many authors. Those who care clinically for the patient may be acknowledged but authors must make a significant contribution to the report.

➤ All the authors contributed to the article

**Thank you very much for your kind and helpful comments. We tried to answer to all comments and rewrote the manuscript according to all the suggestions.**