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Dear Editor,

Thank you for again reviewing our manuscript “A short-term in vivo model for giant cell tumor of bone”.

We changed the manuscript according to the remaining minor recommendations of reviewers 1 and 3.

Here are our point-by-point responses to the concerns of the reviewers. We submitted a revised version as well as a manuscript with highlighted changes.

We are looking forward to have our manuscript published in your journal.

Sincerely,

Maurice Balke, MD
(corresponding author)
Response to Referee 1:

If it is difficult to evaluate the cell pellet before transplantation to the CAM, the histological analysis on each day should be shown as longitudinal study. The longitudinal study will reveal the vascularisation and the formation process of giant cell, and this manuscript must be more valid and interesting report.

*We agree that a histological evaluation of the growth process would be interesting. Unfortunately it is not possible to perform histological analyses of the same tumor at different time points of development, because the CAM has to be sacrificed for histology. Thus it would only be possible to evaluate different developmental stages of different tumors, which would be less pertinent.*

Response to Referee 2:

*Not needed.*

Response to Referee 3:

Minor Essential Revisions:
There is only a minor concern. As well described in the results and in the discussion sections, the authors could find only few osteoclasts and with few nuclei in the grafted GCT, whereas osteoclasts in GCT biopsies are strongly represented. Therefore, the authors should add a sentence regarding this limit of the study also in the abstract.

*As recommended we changed the results section of the abstract. The sentence: “The tumors were composed of the typical components of GCT, including (CD51+/CD68+) multinucleated giant cells.” Was changed to “The tumors were composed of the typical components of GCT, including (CD51+/CD68+) multinucleated giant cells which were generally less numerous and contained fewer nuclei than in the original tumors.”*