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Reviewer's report:

There are few data about bone metastasis and skeletal event in lung cancer. Therefore, the topic of this article is interesting.

However, several points should be re-assessed.

Major Compulsory Revisions

In General
1. English editing is essential! For example, a word “anyway” in the introduction section is not appropriate in scientific journal. Good manuscript writing for delivering original ideas and information to the readers is also one of the important points.

2. So what is the purpose of this study? What is the conclusion? The authors should make the purpose and conclusion more short and clear.

Introduction and methods
1. In page 6 line 6, make the purpose of this study more short and clear.

In page 7 statistical analysis section, authors say the primary outcome is to investigate the impact of bone metastatic disease on survival.

Authors intended to tell too more things in one article. Just focus on main finding.

Results
1. In page 11 second paragraph, the analysis of pre-therapeutic biological parameters including blood test seems to be unnecessary.

In the context of the main idea, if authors want to analysis the association of blood test results with survival, it should be integrated into the univariate and multivariate analysis.

2. Progression on What? In page 12, the impact of bone metastasis on PFS was analyzed. Is the progression about the systemic treatment- chemotherapy? especially fist line?

3. In page 13 first paragraph, the analysis of initial characteristics of bone disease and second SRE is interesting. Although negative results and limitations, more information would be better.
4. In page 14, the descriptions of two unique cases are unnecessary. This article is not case report but original article. Analyze the cases and just summary them.

Discussion
1. Too long. Make the texts short and brief.
2. In page 15, citing unpublished data is inappropriate to the scientific journal.

Conclusion
1. Discussion about using bisphosphonate in the conclusion section is unnecessary. That was already mentioned before.

Minor Essential Revisions
The limitation of this study should be mentioned. Especially, recent treatment trend in NSCLC is not considered in this study- EGFR mutation and TKI. This is not logical flaw. However, whether the lung cancer patient has mutation or not influences PFS and OS greatly, nowadays.

Comments:
Interesting but not organized.
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