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I am sending you herewith a revised manuscript of the paper Prognostic factors for disease-specific survival in 108 patients with Hürthle cell thyroid carcinoma: a single-institution experience by Rok Petric, Barbara Gazic and Nikola Besic.

We are thankful to the editor for comments which undoubtedly helped a lot to improve the paper.

We indicated precisely the changes we made in response to the comments and we prepared a list in which we outlined all the responses to each of these. The changes we made in response to the comments in the text are marked with red color.

All the authors have agreed to the submission of this manuscript in its present form. The work has not been published or submitted elsewhere.

Kindly consider this paper for publication in the BMC Cancer.

Sincerely yours

Nikola Besic
List of corrections:

- Line 126-130: the wording here is awkward. Consider changing to: After surgical procedures macroscopic tumor was present on the trachea in 6 cases, the esophagus in 4 cases, the larynx in 2 cases, the carotid artery in 2 cases, mediastinal vessels in 2 cases, recurrent laryngeal nerve in 1 case and the prevertebral fascia in 1 case.

The wording was changed as suggested by the editor.

- Line 95-96: Additional diagnostic work-up (XRay, US...). Remove X-Ray and US, as it is stated in the previous sentence that all patients underwent XRay and US.

X-Ray and US was removed.

- 155-156: Was the time frame for survival starting from the first day of treatment? If yes, please clarify this for all survival definitions.

The definitions for disease-specific survival, overall survival and disease-free survival were clarified.

- Line 167: the wording here is awkward. Consider changing to: Metastatic lymph nodes were found in level 2 in 3 cases, level 3 in 4 cases etc...

The wording was changed as suggested by the editor.

Table 1: For pT - please separate Tx T1 and T2 into separate rows

pT was separated into separate rows (Tx, T1 and T2).

Table 4: This a very detailed and well research summary, but does not contribute to the paper much. Please remove it. The information should be summarized in 1-2 sentences in the discussion.

Table 4 was deleted.

In the discussion section the following sentences were inserted (lines 225-226 and lines 268-269).

Prognostic factors were related to: patient’s characteristics [6,19], tumor [6,9,11,17,19,23], extent of disease [1,6,9,17,19,23] and treatment [1,6,19,23].

Predictive factors were related to: patient’s characteristics [1], tumor [14,15,17,22], extent of disease [1,15,17,23] and treatment [1,23].

Discussion: Move the strengths and limitations paragraphs to the end of the discussion (just before conclusions).

The strengths and limitations paragraphs were moved to the end of the discussion.