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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1: Dear Ernest Ekpo, Ph.D,

Thank you for clarification of several questions. Your time and effort is appreciated.

This is a case report of adverse events following percutaneous computed tomography-guided lung biopsy. The report is well detailed and relevant to clinical practice. However, I have a few minor comments that need to be addressed.

1. Abstract.

Conclusion: It reads more like a recommendation. Needs to be revised as it does not capture the findings.

Response: We had revised the conclusion. Please refer to text page 3 line 30. We'd like to thanks for your friendly reminder.

2. Keywords: should be words that do not appear in the title

Response: We had changed the keywords to “complications, lung mass, chest imaging”. Please refer to text page 3 line 52. Thanks for your friendly reminder.

3. Introduction: The condition is well described; however a statement highlighting the rationale for this case report is needed
Response: We had revised the introduction. Please refer to text page 7 line 49. Thanks for your suggestion.

4. Discussion: The first sentence is repetitive. It appears in the introduction
P9 lines 26-30: The subheading in bold is not necessary
P9 line 58: subheading not relevant
P10 line 33: subheading not relevant

Response:
(1) We had removed the first sentence. Please refer to text page10 line 20.

(2) We had deleted the subheadings in bold. Please refer to text page 11 line 27 and page 12 line 10.

Thanks for your friendly reminder.

5. Conclusion: This is a repetition of that in the abstract and does not summarize the findings of the case report. This needs to be revised to reflect the findings before this recommendation

Response: We had revised the conclusion. Please refer to text page 13 line 47. Thanks for your friendly reminder.

Reviewer #2: Dear Richard Castillo, Ph.D.

Thank you for clarification of several questions. Your time and effort is appreciated.

1. Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.
Response: We had revised our file name with annotated version. Thanks for your friendly reminder.

2. I would, however, ask that the authors clarify their recommendations and/or procedural modifications resulting from their experience with this case. Under what explicit conditions should serial CT be performed following the procedure? And is there any consideration as to the cost/benefit associated with increased exposure to radiation from serial CT versus the likelihood of the embolism? There is some confusion as to whether the suggestion is to perform serial CT to diagnose an otherwise un-diagnosed occurrence, or rather to perform serial CT when embolism is already suspected, in which case, I may be missing something as to the significance of the report.

Response:

(1) Thanks for your friendly reminder.

(2) In our daily practice in our hospital, a post-biopsy CT scan is performed routinely in every patient to evaluate complications. If air embolism is detected in a routine post-biopsy CT scan, another delayed CT scan is recommended to follow the air’s course in an asymptomatic patient. If this delayed CT scan does not demonstrate air emboli in the coronary artery, left heart, or thoracic aorta, either no air entrance or recanalization of the coronary artery occurred. We had revised the discussion. Please refer to text page 13 line 7.

3. If improvements to the English language within your manuscript have been requested, you should have your manuscript reviewed by someone who is fluent in English. If you would like professional help in revising this manuscript, you can use any reputable English language editing service. We can recommend our affiliates Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES_BS) and American Journal Experts (http://bit.ly/AJE_BS) for help with English usage.

Response: Thanks for your friendly suggestion. We had applied English language editing by Editage service from the web site www.editage.com for revised manuscript to make the manuscript more fluent in English.