

Response to reviewers' comments

Dear Editors, dear Reviewers,

We really appreciate yours and the reviewer's useful comments and thoughtful suggestions. Your extensive knowledge on the relevant research fields helped me make the manuscript prudent. Based on these comments and suggestions, we have made careful modifications on the original manuscript. We hope the new manuscript will meet your magazine's standard. Below you will find our point-by-point responses to the reviewers' comments.

Thanks again for all the comments and suggestions!

Response to Reviewer # 00227375

Comments:

This is an interesting manuscript about the relevant diagnosis and outcomes in patients with leiomyosarcoma. The patients were divided into the uterine leiomyosarcoma group and non-uterine leiomyosarcoma group based on tumor origin. The data demonstrated that serum tumor makers have limited ability in leiomyosarcoma diagnosis. In addition, ultrasonography has limited ability in distinguishing between benign and malignant foci. As for outcomes, there were no significant differences between uterine leiomyosarcoma group and non-uterine leiomyosarcoma group. However, FIGO stage was a significant predictor of progression-free survival. This manuscript is nicely structured and well written. I have no question about this manuscript.

Response:

We really appreciate for your comments! On the basis of carefully reading the manuscript, the reviewer gave a very considerable evaluation. We revised the highlights and emphasized the research prospect. After these modifications, the overall scientific quality of the article has been improved. In addition, we also adjusted the structure of the manuscript and the format of the references. We hope our manuscript could meet the requirements of the journal.

Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 53510

Title: Outcomes of Patients with Pelvic Leiomyosarcoma Treated by Surgery and Relevant Auxiliary Diagnosis.