

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your letter and advice. We also appreciate the constructive criticisms of the reviewers. This letter explains the changes made to the manuscript 'Multilocular thymic cysts - easily misdiagnosed as malignant tumor on CT—A case report' (No. 90420) in response to the comments of the reviewers. A point-by-point summary of all revisions is at the end of this letter.

With best wishes,
Chuanming Li

Reviewer 1:

Q 1: Background of the case needs to be better formatted with appropriate grammar check and sentence formation.

Response: Background of the case had been formatted with appropriate grammar check and sentence formation. (Page 1, Line 24-35)

Q 2: The authors need to explain in the abstract, what is the main take away lesson from this case.

Response: The main take away lesson had been added in the revised version. (Page 1, Line 16-18)

Q 3: I recommend that the authors describe the radiologic findings in a better language and mention the CT value (Hu) to better correlate characteristics of the thymic mass.

Response: The radiologic findings including CT value and size of lesion had been describe in detail in the revised version. (Page 2, Line 6-17)

Q 4: I recommend to list the tumor markers in a table format as well.

Response: A table of the tumor markers had been added in the revised version. (Table 1)

Q 5: The authors did not explain how they concluded with a diagnosis of acute myocarditis, and its etiology.

Response: The basis for how we diagnose acute myocarditis had been added in the revised version. (Page 2, Line 18-20)

Q 6: The authors need to explain the etiology of the pleural effusion, whether it was an exudative or transudative effusion, although it was assumed to be secondary to myocarditis, provide any pleural fluid cytology results, if available.

Response: Due to the lack of pleural fluid cytology results, we are unable to explain the cause of pleural effusion. This is a limitation of this case.

Q 7: Thymic cysts are diagnosed according to the pathologic diagnostic criteria of the World Health Organization., which should be discussed in the discussion part of the manuscript for better clarity.

Response: The diagnostic criteria and related discussion had been added in the revised version. (Page 3, Line 2-10)

Q 8: The authors need to describe the radiologic findings with better language and commenting on the size and shape of the lesion, margins, correlation with surrounding structures, CT value of the lesion, etc.

Response: These radiologic findings had been described with better language and commenting in the revised version. (Page 2, Line 6-17)

Q 9: A thorough review of literature, describe and tabulate prior reported cases to make

their case stronger for publication.

Response: We had conducted a comprehensive review of the literature and tabulated previously reported cases in the revised version. (Table 2)