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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,
We are pleased to resubmit our manuscript with the revisions suggested by you and the reviewers. We hope with the revised manuscript to be more straightforward in what we would like to tell with this article.

About the comments of Dr Silvina Bocca.
- We have revised the English grammar and we hope this time the article will be more readable.
- Unfortunately the sonographic images (2001) attached to the exhibit of the examination are not available, we have just the description, and there are not reported the measures, but we have the measures of the uterus after the surgical removal and we have reported those measures in the text.

About the comments of Dr Eugene Justine Kongnyuy.
- Actually we revised the English grammar, and we would like to thank for your suggestions.
- We revised the conclusions trying to be more clear, and to express what we would like to tell with this case report.
- We revised also the conclusion in the abstract, and now it is coherent with that in the main text.

About the comments of Dr Jan-Hendrik Egberts.
- All the masses have low proliferation index and low number of mitosis in 10 HPF; in the text we have reported some more information about this point.
- Due to technical problems we cannot achieve better quality for the images. The patient has done the examinations in different places and the digital formats (DICOM) are not available. So the one image reported is done with a low-end digital scanner for transparent supports. We apologize for the quality of the image. So we think that in this case more images will not be more informative.
- With the revised manuscript we think that we have followed the suggested structure for the discussion (incidence, pathology, diagnosis, therapeutic possibilities, explanation for the chosen treatment regimen). We tried to review the therapeutic approaches. Specifically what we would like to review here is the variety of chemotherapy approaches to have a general view of what it has been done since now in this field. And try to explain the choice we have done when we treated the patient after surgical removal with megestrol. We read with interest the article of Egberts and colleagues, and we think that this is a really clear overview of the disease. In our discussion of this case report we try to do something that we do not find in our literature review, that is a general overview of all the therapeutic approaches found in the literature. We hope that after the English grammar review our intention will be more clear.

Finally we would thanks the Editor and the reviewers for the consideration given to our article.

Sincerely,
ambrogio p londero