Dear reviewer:

I am very grateful to your comments for the manuscript. According with your advice, we amended the relevant part in manuscript. Some of your questions were answered below.

Reviewer #1

Comment 1: The language needs to be looked at by an English language expert, as the sentences convey an erroneous meaning at several places.

Response: We carefully revised the language problems and asked English experts to make modifications.

Comment 2: The author list includes 6 neurosurgeons. There is no radiologist or pathologist, although detailed figures have been provided.

Response: We have provided radiologist and pathologist who participated in the study.

Comment 3: The legend of the MRI is incomplete, in fact there is no description of findings in the figure legend, and only the sequences are enlisted. The description of MRI in the main manuscript is also incorrect and does not use standard terminology.

Response: We added complete MRI legend and detailed description in the figure legend.

Reviewer #2

Comment 1: Add the unique of this study compared to other studies discuss the same issue.

Response: Compared with other studies, we analyzed and summarized the surgical choice and prognosis in the discussion part.

Comment 2: Add more on the basic of NF1 using this ref -Razek AAKA. MR imaging of neoplastic and non-neoplastic lesions of the brain and spine in neurofibromatosis type I. Neurol Sci 2018; 39:821-827.

Response: We added more on the basic of NF1 in the introduction and discussion part using your recommended reference.

Comment 3: Discus role of advanced imaging such as DWI using this ref -Razek AAKA, Ashmalla GA. Assessment of paraspinal neurogenic tumors with diffusion-weighted MR imaging. Eur Spine J 2018; 27:841-846.

Response: In the discussion part, we mentioned the use of DWI in differentiating ganglioneuroma and schwannoma.

Comment 4: English language correction through the manuscript.

Response: We carefully revised the language problems and asked English experts to make modifications.

Reviewer #3

Comment 1: Some detail on the MRI sequences (type of scanner, file strength, specification of T1- and T2 weighted sequences (TR, TE), contrast agent, contrast dose).

Response: We added complete MRI legend and detailed description in the figure legend.

Comment 2: Show AD, BE and CF at gray scales matched to show uninvolved tissues similarly before and after surgery.

Response: According to your advice, we added and modified corresponding figure.
Comment 3: Include the pre-contrast images as well as the T2-weighted images.
Response: According to your advice, we added and modified corresponding figure.
Comment 4: Describe in the case report the appearance of the tumors on T2, T1pre and T1post mentioning boundaries, encapsulation, signal intensity and heterogeneity.
Response: We added complete MRI legend and detailed description in the figure legend.
Comment 5: Discuss the MRI appearance of the tumors in this study as compared with previous studies.
Response: The MRI appearance of the tumors in our study is low signal intense on T1-weighted image and high signal intense on T2-weighted image with heterogeneous enhancement. And we discussed the difference of MRI appearance due to the pathological components.
Comment 6: Was diffusion weighted MRI included? If so, show the results.
Response: Sorry, the patient did not perfect DWI.

Yours sincerely,
Chunyu Tan