

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you so much for your feedback and the reviewer's comments regarding our article "A rare haemolymphangioma with multiple haemangiomas of the liver in elderly woman with a history of gynecological malignancy" (ID: 68946). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding to our future researches. We have studied comments thoughtfully, and have made some changes which we hope to meet with your approval. Revised portions are marked in red font in the paper. The responses to the editor's advice and reviewer's comments are as follows:

Responses to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

1. Comment: (risk factors)

Response: As you pointed out, we had stated the existence of these factors more clearly.

2. Comment: (pathologist and IHC findings)

Response: Thank you very much for your advice, a pathologist was added in the author list. In addition, microscopic and IHC findings were added as a separate figure (Figure 2). However, macroscopy of the resection specimen was regrettably missing during routine clinical work, thus posing a limitation to our study, as macroscopy was an informative image.

3. Comment: (Repetition of the introduction in the discussion section)

Response: According to your suggestion, repetitions were removed throughout the text.

4. Comment: (Haemolymphangioma may have malignant potential?)

Response: Thank you for your valuable comments, we had added and explained the detailed information of potential recurrence of haemolymphangioma. In addition, haemolymphangioma may present the risk of malignancy owing to the recurrence and invasion of adjacent organs had been reported.

5. Comment: (can treatment affect the progression of such lesions?)

Response: According to your advice, relevant discussion of the surgery treatment with the progression of hepatic haemolymphangioma was added.

Thank you for your review and helpful comments.

Reviewer #2:

Thank you very much for your valuable comments.

Reviewer #3:

1. Comment: (some grammatical errors)

Response: Thank you for your comment, we are sorry for our relatively poor syntax, so we asked native English speakers from American Journal Express (AJE) to help us revise grammar accordingly, and the revision certification was uploaded as supplementary material.

2. Comment: (Erroneous numbering)

Response: Thank you for your comment, the numbering was corrected.

Thank you for your careful review and thoughtful comments.

Science editor

Thank you very much for your kind reminder. In the revised manuscript, microscopic and IHC findings were supplied as separate figure, and information about the tumor is in the form of a repetition of the intro were removed.

(1) Title was shorten no more than 18 words; (2) The approved grant application form(s) was provided. (3) Original figure documents were provided. (4) PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list were added.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.




Figure.1




Figure.2