Author's response to reviews

Title: Seminal vesicle metastasis after partial hepatectomy for hepatocellular carcinoma

Authors:

Li Gong (gongli76_fmmu@yahoo.cn)
Wen M Zheng (zhwdgl@126.com)
Hong Y Li (liyhz0123@sohu.com)
Dong W Zhang (zhangwendong2@tom.com)
Jun W Bo (zwdgl@sohu.com)
Fang L Shi (shilifang@126.com)
Wei Zhang (gltzwd16@fmmu.edu.cn)

Version: 2 Date: 31 July 2010

Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear editor and reviewer,

At first, We would like to express my appreciation to you and the reviewer for suggesting how to improve our paper. Thank you very much for giving me the chance to revise our manuscript. We know it is very important to enlist chronologically the images. We have been collecting the data of the patient according to the reviewer’s comment. However, We have not obtained the CT or MRI images because the patient has not kept his old documents. More regrettably, the CT or MRI images can not be found in the other hospital because their files management system record only that within a year. Thus, We can only provided the images of the abdominal ultrasound examination in our hospital. Of course, the most important image which shows the seminal vesicle metastasis did not be included because the patient performed the related CT or ultrasound examination in the other hospital. However, the patient’s history was real absolutely. We hope sincerely that the revised manuscript is now suitable for the reviewer’s request. Thanks!

The answer to reviewer can be seen the following page.

Best wishes!
Reviewer's report and our answers:
The authors have addressed the questions raised by the reviewers however the detailed history of the patient is still not adequately presented.

Answer: We have reedited the patient’s history, and hope it can reach your request. Therapies, AFP levels and imaging should be enlisted chronologically, in order to convince the reader that the metastasis was primarily in the seminal vesicle and that the seminal vesicle was not just invaded by peritoneal metastasis of the HCC. Furthermore the therapy applied, left hepatectomy, multiple RFA followed by resection and so on has to be explained, since it is unclear why primary resection of the right lobe was not done.

Answer: We know it is very important to enlist chronologically the images. We have been collecting the data of the patient according to the reviewer’s comment. However, we have not obtained the CT or MRI images because the patient has not kept his old documents. More regrettably, the CT or MRI images can not be found in the other hospital because their files management system record only that within a year. Thus, we can only provided the images of the abdominal ultrasound examination in our hospital. Of course, the most important image which shows the seminal vesicle metastasis did not be included because the patient performed the related CT or ultrasound examination in the other hospital. However, the patient’s history was real absolutely. We hope sincerely that the revised manuscript is now suitable for the reviewer’s request.

Moreover, the primary resection of the right lobe was performed in September 2008, and which was described in line 18 to line 26 in Case Presentation.

The others state that chemotherapy was performed, what agent was given and at what time. Thymic peptide injection is not a chemotherapy.

Answer: We looked up carefully the patient’s history, and knew he did not receive the chemotherapy except the radiofrequency ablation therapy.

Furthermore, the sentence that symptomatic therapy was not performed because of the weakness of the patient? Certainly, symptomatic therapy can be applied in this situation, I guess they mean that specific antitumoral therapy could not be given.
Answer: You are right, it is that specific antitumoral therapy could not be given, and we have revised the sentence.