

Dear Editor, Dear reviewers

Thank you for your letter dated March 24. Based on your comment and request, we have made extensive modification on the original manuscript. We thank the reviewers for the time and effort that they have put into reviewing the previous version of the manuscript. Their suggestions have enabled us to improve our work. Based on the instructions provided in your letter, we uploaded the file of the revised manuscript. Accordingly, we have uploaded a copy of the original manuscript with all the changes highlighted by using the track changes mode in MS Word. A revised manuscript with the correction sections red marked was attached as the supplemental material and for easy check/editing purpose. Should you have any questions, please contact us without hesitate.

We would like also to thank you for allowing us to resubmit a revised copy of the manuscript.

Reviewer 1:

Specific Comments to Authors: The work is interesting, although it is a case report, for the rarity of the cases present it is good that the literature is cited. With the precautions that the authors have had, it is evident that the diagnosis is not easy and that it is important to differentiate it from what can be a pelvic tumor. It is interesting to see how in this case the infection concerned only the pelvis and did not spread to the other organs as well as to note the difficulty of the authors in completely removing the capsule, so all this information must become part of the cultural trunk of a colonproctologist surgeon in such a way as to know how to behave in the face of such a pathology.

Response:

We thank you for that excellent and insightful series of remarks. This is indeed a rare case, which may provide clinicians with new ideas in the face of difficult pelvic masses.

Reviewer 2:

Specific Comments to Authors: Although the objective of presenting a new case of primary pelvic hydatidosis is interesting to add cases and describe the clinical and imaging parameters of this disease, such a presentation does not seem to be so rare in the literature. On the other hand, I recommend a review of the writing of the work in terms of coherence of tenses and grammatical and semantic style.

Response:

Thank you very much for the positive comments and constructive suggestions. In the case of this study, only the pelvic cavity was involved, but not other organs. Most studies have shown multiple organ involvement. However, rare organ involvement is usually associated with common organ involvement. In our case,

however, this association was not observed. We have revised the writing of this work from the perspective of tense coherence, grammar and semantic style.

We hope that the revised manuscript is accepted for publication in the World Journal of Clinical Cases.

We adopted the reviewer's recommendations and revised the language of the full text. From the above comments, we recognize a lot of language modification and other issues, and have also revised the full text. We have revised the writing of this work from the perspective of tense coherence, grammar and semantic style. thank you for your patient comments.

Sincerely,

Ayifuhan Ahan