

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Imaging presentation of biliary adenofibroma: A case report and review of literature" (ID: 70728). 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. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as flowing:

Responds to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

1. Response to comment: the abstract should not include references citations
Response: References and citations in the abstract have been deleted and the order of references have been adjusted.

2. Response to comment: all the abbreviated words should be explained at their first use

Response: We have studied the manuscript carefully, and all the abbreviated words used for the first time have been explained.

3. Response to comment: the tables with timeline should not be inserted there, but explained in the text inside the paper

Response: The table has been deleted. There is no specific date in the manuscript. The examination one month after the operation has been explained in the manuscript (page 5, line 1).

4. Response to comment: at the final diagnosis I would not repeat that this tumor is benign as it was already explained before in the paper

Response: We have deleted the definition that this tumor is a benign tumor in the corresponding position of the manuscript (page 4, line 19, page 4, line 7, page 2).

5. Response to comment: better not to repeat information in Introduction and Discussion (see Tsui et al describing the first time the biliary fibradenoma)

Response: Repeated expressions have been removed from the Introduction section and the first paragraph of Discussion section.

6. Response to comment: the list of references should be verified and corrected to follow the journal rules

Response: The references have been revised according to the Format for References Guidelines. There are 3 references from the same journal(1,16,10, *Am J Surg Pathol*), and meet the requirements.

About the PMID and DIO number of references 12: I found this article on the official website of **Turk J Gastroenterol**, and also found that other authors cited this document in many articles. But I didn't find the PMID and DIO number.

7. Response to comment: the grammar and punctuation should be improved

Response: Once all contents have been carefully revised, the manuscript will be submitted to the language editing company recommended by the editorial for grammar and other modifications to meet the requirements

Reviewer #2:

Response to comment: Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Response: Once all contents have been carefully revised, the manuscript will be submitted to the language editing company recommended by the editorial for grammar and other modifications to meet the requirements.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And all the changes are marked in red in revised paper.

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.

Best wishes

Shaopeng LI