

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for considering our manuscript entitled “Microcystic adnexal carcinoma misdiagnosed as a “recurrent epidermal cyst”: a case report” for publication in the *World Journal of Clinical Cases*. We thank the editor and reviewers for providing constructive comments and suggestions, which improved the manuscript substantially. All items raised have been addressed in the revision, and our point-by-point responses are detailed below.

This revised manuscript has been carefully edited and proofread by *Medjaden Bioscience Limited*.

We hope that this further revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication in your journal, and again, we thank you for your consideration.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Fu-qiu Li

Responses to Reviewers

We thank you for the comprehensive and thoughtful review, which helped improve the manuscript significantly. We have addressed all points raised and revised the manuscript accordingly. All changes, as well as responses to all questions, are detailed below:

Reviewer 1 :Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

1. What did the authors mean by “economic reasons” for wide excision surgery. Explain this in 1-2 sentences in the corresponding section.

Response: Thank you so much for the suggestion. MMS was much more expensive than WLE, and he had little choice but to go with WLE because his family was impoverished.

2. Please review the language of the manuscript there are several type mistakes in the text. (For example in conclusion section the word «the» in the first sentence repeats itself.

Response: Thank you so much for pointing out the critical issue. The several type mistakes in the text have been rectified, and the manuscript has been polished further by a professional English language editing company.

3. Please discuss the importance of timely histological examination. It is often common for a medical facility to perform histology for all biological specimens (including benign skin lesions). The patient may have received a better treatment years ago if the skin specimen was studied histologically.

Response: Many thanks for the constructive suggestion. We must appreciate the value of a prompt histological evaluation. A medical facility's standard practice is to perform histology on all biological material (including benign skin lesions). If the skin samples had been evaluated histologically years ago, the patient could have received better therapy.

Reviewer 2:Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

1. good case but needs minor language policing.

Response: This revised manuscript has been carefully edited and proofread by Medjaden Bioscience Limited to perform further language polishing that will ensure all grammatical, syntactical, formatting and other related errors be resolved, so that the revised manuscript will meet the publication requirement (Grade A).

EDITORIAL OFFICE' S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office' s comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

Science editor: This manuscript is about a rare tumor. The manuscript lacks flow and syntax at many places. Discussion needs to be further enriched with review of literature. 1. History must come prior to work up of the patient. (long-term history of excessive ultraviolet irradiation) 2. CONCLUSION- What's the relation of renal cell carcinoma with MAC that needs to be mentioned in Conclusion ? (its chance phenomenon) 3. CONCLUSION- It is better to suggest that "Any recurrence of tumor in elderly patients must be viewed with suspicion". Rephrase the Conclusion in Abstract and manuscript. 4. CORE TIP- "particular medical history of right clear cell renal carcinoma" As there is no co-relation or association, this medical history needs to be mentioned but has no relevance. Remove from the Core tip. 5. Why this approach for a superficial tumor ? Clarify what is meant by your (Trans-oral excision) 6. "Patient satisfaction with the effect of reconstruction is noted" How this was noted ? 7. Mention classical microscopic features of this tumor in the HPE. 8. Mention status of neck nodes during physical examination. 9. "Whether there is a connection between renal malignant tumors and MAC remains to be explored" Rephrase the statement and put better context. 10. There is repeat of clinical findings in the last paragraph of the discussion. Use it judiciously.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Response: We have made the requested revision.

Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office' s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, "Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...". Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author' s intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further

improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Response: We have made the requested revision.