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Author’s response to reviews:

REVIEWER 1:

We are grateful to Reviewer 1 for the useful suggestion that improve our paper. We have taken the suggestion into account in the revised paper.
Comment)

In the abstract "After treatment, bilateral kidneys resulted in atrophy..." should be something like "after treatment with steroids, repeat imaging suggested bilateral atrophy.

"Response: Thank you very much for helpful comment. We have revised the sentence.”

REVIEWER 2:

We are grateful to Reviewer 2 for the reasonable suggestion that improves our paper. We have taken the suggestion into account in the revised paper.

comment)

“Although the authors agreed with the reviewer's suggestion and explained that based on the clinical course and imaging results before and after treatment, it is reasonable that diffuse low intensity and high intensity parts are lesions and normal kidney, respectively, the title and abstract are still very confusing. Therefore, this case report is not acceptable because the imaging description of this paper would mislead readers of this journal.

Response: Thank you very much for a reasonable comment. Your comment in first revise made our paper more reasonable and convincing. The most important points of this case are diagnosis including radiological evaluation and successful treatment of highly advanced IgG4-RKD. However, as you pointed out, the title and abstract did not adequately describe those points and clinical findings. We revised the title and abstract. We used the description “renal mass-like regions”, because renal mass-like regions in this case looked IgG4RKD lesions first, but was actually normal part of kidney In addition, we changed sentences L105-L106 in background, L135-L137 in case presentation, L167-L170 and L195-L201 in Conclusion to correct grammatical error or to make case presentation and discussion clearer.".