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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Many thanks for your letter (May 13, 2014) about our manuscript “A bilateral neoplasm in chest: a case report and literature review (MS: 3411387381163928)” and thanks for the referees taking time to deal with the manuscript and giving our suggestions. These suggestions are all valuable and very helpful for improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. According to the referees' suggestions, we have carefully amended and corrected the related contents in our paper. In addition to the referees’ suggestions, we also have made some small revisions in the manuscript. These revisions will not influence the content and framework of the paper. Revised parts have been highlighted using blue text in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responses to the referees’ comments are as following.

Reviewer's report

Title: A bilateral neoplasm in chest: a case report and literature review

Version: 1 Date: 14 April 2014

Reviewer: Mohammad Vaziri

Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

1-Abstract: the first and the last sentences in the case presentation section should be corrected and rewritten.

Thank you for your attention and time to our article and valuable suggestions. We are sorry for not clear enough to write sentences in the abstract. So we have corrected and rewritten them in the revision using blue text. We deeply
appreciate your carefulness in work.

The second sentence in the conclusion section needs correction.

Thank you for your attention and time to our article and valuable suggestions. We are sorry for not clear enough to write the sentence in the abstract. So we have corrected and rewritten it in the revision using blue text.

2-Background: the first sentence should be rewritten correctly.

Thank you for your attention to our article and valuable questions as well as suggestions. We are sorry for not clear enough to write the sentence. So we have corrected and rewritten it in the revision using blue text.

3-Case Presentation: the word "macroscopically" in the last paragraph should be changed to "microscopically".

Thank you for your attention to our article and valuable questions as well as suggestions. So we have corrected and rewritten it in the revision using blue text.

4-Coclusion: the last sentence of the third paragraph should be rewritten correctly.

Thank you for your attention to our article and valuable questions as well as suggestions. So we have corrected and rewritten it in the revision using blue text.

5-References: there are many references that can be omitted as they are unrelated to the main context of this case report (an extra-adrenal myelolipoma)

Thank you for your attention to our article and valuable questions as well as suggestions. We are sorry for putting many references that are unrelated to the main context. So we have deleted them in the revision. We deeply appreciate your carefulness in work.

Reviewer’s report
Title: A bilateral neoplasm in chest: a case report and literature review
Version: 1 Date: 21 April 2014
Reviewer: Jens Schittenhelm
Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

Why was the right myelolipoma also operated three months later? As an asymptomatic lesion <4 cm in size there is usually no surgical intervention necessary. Confident pathological dianosis from the left lesion should have been
available at this time.

Thank you for your attention and time to our article and valuable suggestions. We are sorry for not clear enough to point out the patient information in the manuscript. We have advised him that there is usually no surgical intervention necessary for an asymptomatic lesion <4 cm in size, while he insisted that the operation should be done via video-assisted thoracic surgery three months later. So the right myelolipoma was also operated.

Histology (figure 3) shows only very few adipocytes between a full trilineage maturation of the three major blood-forming elements. The figure legend should reflect this.

Thank you for your attention and time to our article and valuable suggestions. We are sorry for not clear enough to point out the information in the context. So we have added it in the revision using blue text. We deeply appreciate your carefulness in work.

- Minor Essential Revisions

Please check the manuscript carefully for missing punctuation marks. Some spaces between words are missing (example "frombonemarrow").

Thank you for your attention and time to our article and valuable suggestions. We are sorry for not clear enough to write sentences in the context. So we have corrected and rewritten them in the revision using blue text. We deeply appreciate your carefulness in work.

- Discretionary Revisions

A bilateral extradrenal myelolipoma is rarer than a thoracic myelolipoma. The authors should discuss the literature how many of their 16 mentioned cases were also bilateral.

Thank you for your attention to our article and valuable questions as well as suggestions. We are sorry for not clear enough to point out the patient information in the manuscript. In the Table 1, we recorded the number and the location of the primary myelolipomas in thorax and only three cases were bilateral. We deeply appreciate your carefulness in work.