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Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors:

1. The paper “Starry liver”: Von Meyenburg complex clinical case presentation and differential diagnosis discussion” discusses the importance of accurate diagnostic of this rare congenital disorder. This case very good emphasizes that the knowledge of differential diagnostic features of the condition is essential to establish the correct diagnosis. The paper is well written, clear and easy to understand. I recommend this paper should be accepted with minor revision.

Response: We thank the Reviewer for highlighting the clinical relevance of the subject and recommending this paper for publishing with minor revision.

2. Page 14: Figure 3 Gadolinium contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance cholangiography. Multiple lesions were hypointense on T1-weighted imaging and hyperintense on T2. No communication between hamartomas and biliary ducts; noticeable typical formation of a “starry sky.” - which particular MRI sequence is shown in the picture?

Response: We thank the Reviewer for pointing on this important detail. We added this information to the Figure 4 legend (Cholangio-RM (coronal thick slab T2 MIP)).

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors:

1. In figure 3 MRI imagings should add T1WI and T2WI.
Response: We thank the Reviewer for his/her suggestion. Unfortunately, we do not have available the TW1 image, but we described the appearance of the biliary hamartomatosis on T1W as well as on TW2 (lines 141-144, page 5; and in the Table 1).

2. It is suggested to add the pathological image of puncture biopsy.

Response: We agree with the Reviewer’s comment and we added the original pathological image of the liver puncture biopsy, performed by our Pathology Unit (Figure 3).

3. Some references are a bit old and may be replaced with newer ones if possible.

Response: We thank the Reviewer for his/her comment. We updated the references # 17 and #20 that were dated back to 2009 and 2005 years correspondingly and now they contain references to articles published no earlier than 2020.