

## Answering Reviewers

1. Image is important information in this case, so the manufacturer and product type must be given. And the use of fat suppression should be discussed.

⇒ **I added manufacturer and product type of all images. In addition, I also added the use of fat suppression in section of "Case Report".**

2. The two frames of MRI are not at the same level of cross section.

⇒ **I modified the level of cross section.**

3 The methods used for the 6-month follow-up needs mentioning.

⇒ **I added the information about the 6-month follow-up.**

4. The legend of Figure 1 is confusing. Is there one tumor or more?

⇒ **I changed the expression of legend, Figure 1 to "tumor". Also, I modified the sentence of abstract.**

5. Typo- and grammatical errors exist. For example, in the Abstract section, "high enhanced" should be "highly enhanced", and the phrase "low intensity effect" is lack of sense.

⇒ **I modified the typo- and grammatical errors. For example, I modified expression "high enhanced" to "highly enhanced", and "low intensity effect" to "didn't show highly intensity effect".**

6. The authors should describe more details of microscopic findings and the rationale findings of the diagnosis of sclerosing type of ALT (I recommend the term of ALT rather than WDLPS).

⇒ **I added Figure 4 for more details of microscopic findings, including of immunostaining. In addition, I added the rationale findings of the diagnosis as ALT in section of "Discussion". Furthermore, I exchanged the term from WDLPS to ALT.**

7. The authors should describe the points of differential diagnosis, especially dedifferentiated liposarcoma. It is very important.

⇒ **I added the points of differential diagnosis, especially dedifferentiated liposarcoma in section of "Discussion".**

8. The quality of HE photographs is not so good. It should be revised.

⇒ **I revised the quality of HE photographs.**

9. The pathological photographs of immunohistochemistry for MDM2 and CDK4 should be

presented.

⇒ **I added Figure 4 for pathological photographs of immunohistochemistry, MDM2 and CDK4.**

10. The title is improper. CARE Check list (2013) indicated that the words “case report” should be in the title. They do not follow CARE Check list (2013). In addition, “Liposarcoma” in title should be revised as “Atypical lipomatous tumor”, if their pathological diagnosis is correct.

⇒ **I revised the title to “Atypical lipomatous tumor occurred in ligamentum teres of liver: A case report and mini-review of literature”. In addition, I revised word from “Liposarcoma” to “Atypical lipomatous tumor” in the manuscript.**

11. The authors should discuss about special strategies, if there were any, they applied during the operation for complete removing the tumor, avoiding bleeding and reducing the recurrent etc.

⇒ **I added the description about special strategies to complete during the operation, in section of “Case Report”, including of applying for removing the tumor, avoiding bleeding and reducing the recurrent.**

12. The conclusion is relatively weak, very little help for doctors who may encounter similar cases. Please think and expand.

⇒ **I modified and added the sentence in section of “Abstract” and “Discussion”.**

13. We have checked your manuscript by CrossCheck. Unfortunately, a significant amount of overlapping text (e.g., an overlap >5% or a similarity >30%) was found in your manuscript. Please read the attached 40249-CrossCheck report for details, then revise your manuscript 40249-Review. Please send it in three working days.

⇒ **We asked an English proofreading company and revised manuscript thoroughly. (shown as yellow painting regions)**