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To the Journal of Medical Case Reports

Regarding Journal of Medical Case Reports MS: 1961280095139291 - Treatment of an aggressive aneurysmal bone cyst with percutaneous injection of polidocanol

Dear Editor,

We herewith submit the revised version of our manuscript entitled “Treatment of an aggressive aneurysmal bone cyst with percutaneous injection of polidocanol- a case presentation.” We would like to thank the Editor and the reviewers for their comments, which helped us improve our manuscript.

Response to the comments made by the Editor and the reviewers.

A. Comments made by the Editor:

“The conclusion remains too strong given that this is just a case report. Perhaps it should state that the Polidocanol can be considered as an option in all forms of ABCs? Also, there is a typo in the last paragraph.”

We have changed the last paragraph (Conclusion) of the manuscript to address this issue. Furthermore, we have corrected the typographical errors.

Please change the ‘Case Report’ section header to ‘Case Presentation’.

The header has been changed

B. Comments made by Reviewer#1.

This article described the role of percutaneous injection of polidocanol in a patient with aggressive aneurysmal bone cyst. The data is useful and warrant. However, a few issues must be clarified. This is a case report not an original article. Your conclusion seems to be overgeneralized. You cannot conclude that polidocanol sclerotherapy is used even for the treatment of “all ABCs,” through this paper though your group has a paper of 38 cases of ABCs.

We have changed the last paragraph (Conclusion) of the manuscript to address this issue.

Minor points
1. Authors mentioned that shoulder ROM (range of motion) was normalized after the procedure. Was the shoulder ROM not normal when she first came to the hospital? (Also, ROM should be written in the full term, when the term is used only once in the paper.)

We have modified the first sentence in the Case Presentation according to the reviewer’s comment.

2. Why did authors decide to perform 6 consecutive injections? What was the interval between the injections?

We performed 6 consecutive injections until the symptoms subsided and we could observe convincing radiological findings of healing of the lesion. The interval between injections was approximately 3 weeks. This is a common practice in our clinic (please see Reference 13. The text has now been modified to address this issue.

3. Some English grammatical errors and typos must be corrected:

   Abstract: line 17, ‘~, but it’s efficacy in the case of # ~, but its efficacy in the case of, line 19.

   A 18-year old female # An 18-year-old female

   Introduction: line 39, Selective arterial embolization or radiotherapy combined or not to cryosurgery # Selective arterial embolization or radiotherapy combined or not with cryosurgery

   Case report: line 49 A 18-year old female # An 18-year-old female

   Figure legends: line 164, Diafysis # Diaphysis

All errors have been corrected according to the above comment

4. The terms, “Magnetic resonance imaging” in case presentation and “Magnetic resonance tomography” in figure legend, are confusing. Please choose one word

The text in Figure Legends has been corrected

C. Comments made by reviewer#2.

Reviewer #2 had no specific comments

We hope that our manuscript meets the requirements of your journal and we would appreciate it if you could consider it for publication.

Sincerely,

Otte Brosjö
Panagiotis Tsagozis