

Dear Professors:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Villous adenoma coexistent with focal well-differentiated adenocarcinoma of female urethral orifice: A case report and review of the literature" (ID: 44926). 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 the comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as following:

REVIEWER 1 EVALUATION

Comments:

1. "During follow-up of 7 mo, the patient was cured and had no recurrence."
Do not use short forms as "mo" Besides in clinical observations you write "During follow-up of 11 months" Is it 7 months or 11 months?

Response: Thank you very much for this valuable comment. We have corrected the mistakes in the manuscript. The patients was followed up for 11 months and there was no recurrence. We feel very sorry about the mistakes.

2. Correct "Core tip: Villous adenoma coexistent with adenocarcinoma of the urinary system is uncommon. " to "Core tip: Villous adenoma coexisting with adenocarcinoma of the urinary system is uncommon."

Correct "villous adenoma coexistent with adenocarcinoma of the female urethral orifice" to "villous adenoma coexisting with adenocarcinoma of the female urethral orifice"

Response: Thank you very much for this valuable comment. We have corrected the mistakes in the manuscript.

3. You write that "Physical examination found a fleshy, hemorrhaged, uneven polypoidal mass 3 × 4 cm in diameter " but then write that "excised lesion was a soft grayish mass, measuring 1.5 cm in diameter" Why this discrepancy? "

Response: Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions. The mass and surrounding tissues were coherent when we carried out the physical examination. The postoperative specimen was stripped tumor tissue, so there was a gap in size between them.

4. Intracellular and extracellular abundant mucin was seen " correct language to "abundant mucin was seen both intracellularly and extracellularly

Response: Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions. We have corrected the inappropriate expression in the manuscript.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.

REVIEWER 2 EVALUATION

Response: Thank you very much for your appreciation. However, we still have some deficiencies which needed to be improved in this work. We have revised our manuscript to improve the effectiveness and clarity of the entire article. Thank you again for your appreciation.

Other changes:

We made some other changes in the manuscript and here we did not list the changes but marked in red and added annotations in the revised paper.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Yours sincerely

Hai-Tao Niu