

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning my manuscript entitled 75426. 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. The main corrections and responses to reviewers' comments in the paper are as follows:

Responds to the Reviewer #1:

Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions on the article. I have further modified the article to better meet the requirements of the journal and repolished the article. Thank you again for your valuable suggestions.

Responds to the Reviewer #2:

Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions on the article. I have further modified the article according to your requirements to achieve better effects and repolish the article. Thank you again for your valuable suggestions.

1. Response to comment: The discussion section would be redundant. Please concise it.

Response : The differential diagnosis of the discussion section has been appropriately deleted according to your requirements.

2. Response to comment : Abbreviations should be opened at the first use, and applied consistently (e.g., CTU).

Response: As requested by the reviewer, the abbreviation is opened at the first use.

3. Response to comment: In discussion section, 'Bladder malacoplakia is an extremely rare disease. There are only 17 reports of 31 cases of bladder malacoplakia in China from 1986 to 2021.' --> Please changed into results on worldwide beside China.

Response : Documents included in pubmed and other databases were consulted at the request of reviewers and a total of 49 articles, 72 cases, had been revised in the discussion section.

Responds to the Reviewer #3:

Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions on the article. I have further modified the article according to your requirements to achieve better results and repolish the article. Thank you again for your valuable suggestions.

1. Response to comment : The manuscript requires some editing: - In "Chief complaints" paragraph; please reformulate the sentence to make it more clear.

Response: The chief complaint has been revised according to the opinions of the reviewer to make it clearer.

2. Response to comment : In "Laboratory examinations" section; please improve the description of the results adding full test name without abbreviation.

Response : Laboratory inspection has been improved according to the requirements of reviewers, adding a complete name.

3. Response to comment: In "OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP" paragraph; * please clarify this (bladder tumor body and basement).

Response : Results and follow-up paragraphs have been clarified as required and grammatical errors modified.

4. Response to comment : In the sentence starting with "With a wide base obvious bleeding necrosis or calcification was found." please add comma before necrosis.

Response: Grammar errors have been modified as required by the reviewer.

5. Response to comment: Dose patient receive any of these medications (cholinergic drugs and/or vitamin C) ?If yes ... please add it.

Response: The patient have not taken cholinergic drugs and vitamin C, has been described in the article.

6. Response to comment : In "DISCUSSION" section: "It has been reported that sulfamethoxazole, quinolones, sulfamethoxazole, and rifampicin have good effects."; please delete sulfamethoxazole.

Response : The discussion section has deleted sulfamethoxazole as required by the reviewer.

7. Response to comment: In "Figure Legends" section; Figure 2. what about Figure 2B.

Response: A supplementary description of Figure 2B has been provided as requested by the reviewer.