

Answering Reviewers

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently presented. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript and the abstract summarizes the work described in the manuscript. I suggest improving the Case presentation in order to describe how the follow-up to the patient was carried out. It is clear that the diagnosis of mammary-type myofibroblastoma is anatomopathological, but in the discussion, given the rarity of the case, it would be appropriate to describe the preoperative (possible imaging study) and postoperative management of this tumor (clinical and/or imaging at follow-up?). In its entirety, the manuscript is interesting for the uniqueness of the case described, and as indicated by the authors, the anatomopathological characteristics of the tumor must be taken into account in the diagnosis of mammary-type myofibroblastoma.

Answer reviewer:

Dear reviewer,

Thank you for your hard work, and thank you for your recognition and praise of this case report.

Your suggestion is very good. We have supplemented the relevant contents in accordance with your opinions. Please check the description of the preoperative and postoperative MRI, and the follow-up results of the patient in the part of the *Imaging examination* of the CASE PRESENTATION and OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP in the revised version.

Since the magazine requires the case report to include imaging examination, treatment, outcome and follow-up, which coincides with the supplementary contents you suggested, I put them in the corresponding position of the revised version for supplementary description, rather than in the discussion part. Hope to get your understanding.

Best regards,

Dr. Yuan-Feng Zeng