

Dear editor,

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewer's comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Incidentally discovered asymptomatic splenic hamartoma misdiagnosed as an aneurysm: A case report" (ID: 66896). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have studied comments carefully. The responds to the reviewer's comments are as following:

Question 1: Authors described a case report of Incidentally discovered asymptomatic Splenic Hamartoma misdiagnosed as an aneurysm. It is fascinating to look at these rare cases. It is well written without any grammatical or spelling errors with the adequate evidences to support the findings of this case. Definitely more exposure is needed in these cases to avoid. major pit falls in the diagnosis and management.

Response: Thank you for Reviewers' comment. This case of splenic hamartoma is the first one we encountered in clinical. In the process of diagnosis and treatment, especially in the preoperative diagnosis, we are still lack of experience. We have consulted a lot of literature and learned a lot of experience after operation, which will be helpful for the preoperative differential diagnosis of splenic hamartoma in the future.

Question 2: First - the authors concluded that imaging tests are of the little use in the diagnosis of SH. Second - the usefulness of laparoscopic splenectomy for the

diagnosis of splenic hamartoma (SH). Third - interesting description of aneurysm misdiagnosis

Response: Thank you for Reviewers' comment.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Xuefeng Cao

E-mail: byfygdwk_cxf@163.com