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Author's response to reviews:

14 October 2014

Dear Chief Editor,

RE : Manuscript number 1431291044124046 (Eligibility criteria for intraoperative radiotherapy for breast cancer: study employing 12,025 patients treated in two cohorts)

Thank you very much for the comments from you and the reviewers regarding this manuscript. According to your suggestions we sent the manuscript to Edanz (http://www.edanzediting.com/) to be edited by one of their experienced medical editors.

With regard to an ethics statement, we have stated very clearly that we were allowed access to the databases as well as the names of the boards that granted this permission.

Shown below are our point-by-point answers to the questions posed by the
reviewers. We hope that, after looking at the revised manuscript, our contribution will be eligible for publication.

Yours sincerely

Amira ZIOUECHE, MD

Answers to questions posed by the Reviewers

Reviewer 1, Dennis Holmes

(1) Consensus guidelines: The aim of our study was not to criticize well-established consensus guidelines but instead to evaluate the proportion of eligible patients in the two cohorts according to the inclusion criteria of TARGIT A and RIOP.

(2) Abstract: We agree that the abstract was difficult to read. A new version has been written (lines 46-73).

Reviewer 2, Jayant Vaidya

(1) The term “E-IORT” has been deleted and we adopted the term “TARGIT” throughout the revised manuscript.

(2) TARGIT E is indeed not expected to give any more comparative data than TARGIT A. Hence, this trial is no longer mentioned in the revised manuscript.

(3) Conclusion: The final line has been modified (line 298-302)

(4) Statistical analyses: The difference in recurrence between T1E and T1nE subgroups is discussed in the revised manuscript (lines 251-254).

(5) Risks factors for recurrence: We agree with your suggestion and a comment has been added in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 3, Renzo Corvo

(1) Methods section: We agree with your suggestion and a comment has been added (line 255-256). RIOP and TARGIT criteria: A new table (Table 1) has been added.

(2) Results and Discussion sections: The percentage of eligible patients for TARGIT is referred to in Table 2 and the data (4036/7580) are mentioned in the main manuscript (line 198). ASTRO and ESTRO criteria: Please see the response to the first comment of D. Holmes.