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Author’s response to reviews:

Summary of Revision

Response to the Assistant Editor Anisa Lowe’s Comments

Comments:

Your manuscript "Feasibility Evaluation of Micro-Optical Coherence Tomography (μOCT) for Rapid Brain Tumor Type and Grade Discriminations based on μOCT Image and Pathology Comparisons: a Randomized Controlled Trail" (BMIM-D-19-00270R2) has been assessed by our reviewers. Based on these reports, and my own assessment as Assistant Editor, I am pleased to inform you that it is potentially acceptable for publication in BMC Medical Imaging, once you have carried out some essential revisions.
Please find my comments, together with any other reviewer reports, below. Please also take a moment to check our website at  https://www.editorialmanager.com/bmim/ for any additional comments that were saved as attachments.

Once you have made the necessary corrections, please submit a revised manuscript online at:

https://www.editorialmanager.com/bmim/

If you have forgotten your password, please use the 'Send Login Details' link on the login page at https://www.editorialmanager.com/bmim/. For security reasons, your password will be reset.

Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style, which can be found at the Submission Guidelines on the journal homepage.

A decision will be made once we have received your revised manuscript, which we expect by 16 Dec 2019.

Response: We sincerely thank the Assistant Editor, Ms. Anisa Lowe, for giving us the precious opportunity to further revise our manuscript. We have very carefully considered each of the comments and made the necessary revisions accordingly. A point-to-point summary of the revisions that have been made is presented as requested, yet the other revisions made have not been marked in the revised manuscript according to the journal regulations. The style of the revised manuscript has also been adjusted to conform to the journal requirements. We earnestly hope that the Assistant Editor could be satisfied with our revisions.

Response and Revisions Based on Comments of Assistant Editor
Detailed comments:

1、Trials

-- Your study falls within the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE)’ definition of a clinical trial: any research study that prospectively assigns human subjects to one or more health related interventions to evaluate the effects on health or biological outcomes. As such, Biomed Central requires that a Trial Registration Number is provided in order for the manuscript to be published.

Although a TRN is usually required prior to the start of the peer-review process, the BMC-series journals do accept retrospectively registered trials. If you have not registered the trial, we therefore request that you do so as soon as possible so that your study can be accepted for publication. All trials must be registered with a WHO approved registry, as listed in the WHO guide: http://www.who.int/ictrp/network/primary/en/.

Once you know your trial registration number, please submit a revised version of your manuscript with the number and date of registration included in the abstract. The last section of the abstract should be Trial Registration: listing the trial registry and the unique identifying number, e.g. Trial registration: Current Controlled Trials ISRCTN73824458, as well as the date of registration. Please note that there should be no space between the letters and numbers of the trial registration number. If registration took place after the first participant was enrolled, please state also “Retrospectively registered” at the end of this section.

Response: We deeply appreciate the careful review conducted by the Assistant Editor, Ms. Anisa Lowe, for improving the integrity of our study. We regret that we missed including the information of trial number in our manuscript in the previous round of reviews.

After evaluating the definition of “Trials” carefully, however, we think that our study may not fall into the category of a “Trail”, and I have misused the term “Trail” due to my engineering background. Such is because in our study, we are not evaluating “the effects on health or biological outcomes” prospectively, instead, we are evaluating the feasibility of “Micro-OCT (µOCT)” as an imaging tool for brain tumor types and grade discriminations based on ex vivo imaging experiments.
Specifically, in the study, we acquired tumor specimen samples from neurosurgeons first, and then conducted µOCT imaging experiments to obtain µOCT images of the brain tumors. After marking those interested imaging points, and obtained the histology images, we then compared the µOCT images and histology images for feasibility evaluation. Within the whole study, all experiments were conducted ex vivo without any prospective actions done to the patients, and thus, we deemed that our study does not fall into the “Trial” study, and we have used the term “a Randomized Controlled Trial” by mistake.

Therefore, in the updated manuscript, we revised the manuscript title, and deleted the term “a Randomized Controlled Trail”. The revised manuscript title is as follows,

“……
Feasibility Evaluation of Micro-Optical Coherence Tomography (µOCT) for Rapid Brain Tumor Type and Grade Discriminations: µOCT Images Versus Pathology
……”

2. Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate.

-- For all research involving human subjects, informed consent to participate in the study should be obtained from participants (or their parent or legal guardian in the case of children under 16) and a statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript. If the need for ethics approval was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this and the reason why, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation.

Response and revision: We deeply thank the Assistant Editor for reading our manuscript carefully and pointing out the Ethical approval and consent issue with the study. We have amended the “Ethics Approval and consent to participate” as follows,

“……
Ethics Approval and consent to participate
All procedures performed in the study involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional research committee (Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University) and with the Declaration of Helsinki 2008 and its later amendments. The study was reviewed and approved by Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University (Approval Number: 2017K-C053). As the whole study has no influences on the diagnosis and treatment of the participants, and their personal privacies, the requirement for informed consent was waived by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University according to the regulations of Declaration of Helsinki 2008.

……”

3、Authors’ Contributions.

-- Currently, the contributions of authors [ZJ] and [YZ] do not automatically qualify them for authorship. In the section “Authors’ contributions”, please provide further clarifications on their contributions, and see our guidelines for authorship below.

An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. Authors are expected to fulfil the criteria below (adapted from McNutt et al., Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Feb 2018, 201715374; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1715374115; licensed under CC BY 4.0):

Each author is expected to have made substantial contributions to the conception OR design of the work; OR the acquisition, analysis, OR interpretation of data; OR the creation of new software used in the work; OR have drafted the work or substantively revised it

AND to have approved the submitted version (and any substantially modified version that involves the author's contribution to the study);

AND to have agreed both to be personally accountable for the author's own contributions and to ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work, even ones in which the author was not personally involved, are appropriately investigated, resolved, and the resolution documented in the literature.

Acquisition of funding, collection of data or general supervision of the research group, alone, does not usually justify authorship.

Anyone who contributed towards the article who does not meet the criteria for authorship can be acknowledged in the ‘Acknowledgements’ section.
Response and revision: We sincerely thank the Assistant Editor, Ms. Anisa Lowe, for reviewing our manuscript carefully. We have provided more details for each of the authors’ contributions, and updated “Author’s Contributions” section as follows,

“……

Author’s Contributions

Y.X., H.C., and Z.W. contributed equally to this work. Y.Z. and L.L. supervised the study. Y.X., Z.W. and D.Q. conceived and designed the experiments. Z.W. performed the neurosurgery. Y.X. constructed the µOCT system, H.C. and Z.J. maintained the system, and acquired the specimen images with µOCT system. Z.J. and D.Q. interpreted the data. Y.X., Y.Z., and L.L. contributed the funds/reagents/materials. Y.X., H.C., and D.Q. drafted the manuscript, S.M., F.Z., Y.Z., and L.L. edited, finalized and approved the submitted version. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

……”

4、 Remove Files.

--Please remove all your current supplementary files from your file inventory, as these are no longer required at this stage of the editorial process.

Please remove any files from your file inventory that you do not wish to be published alongside your manuscript.

Response and revision: We sincerely thank the Assistant Editor for giving us the revision suggestions. We have removed all the current supplementary files from our file inventory.

5、 Clean Manuscript.

-- At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.
Response and revision: We sincerely thank the Assistant Editor for her careful review of our manuscript and the revision suggestions. We have read the whole paper again carefully and deleted all the marked changes. Meanwhile, we have also deleted all those unnecessary indicators marked on the figures. All those figures are cited within the text at the appropriate places, and those figures are uploaded separately.

We earnestly hope that the revised manuscript could meet the standard of a publication in BMC Medical Imaging.

Response and Revisions Based on Comments of Reviewer 1

General comments:

Ingrid Różyło-Kalinowska (Reviewer 1): The Authors have considerably improved their manuscript.

Response: We sincerely thank Prof. Ingrid Różyło-Kalinowska for reviewing our manuscript and give her invaluable revision suggestions and positive comments.

Response and Revisions Based on Comments of Reviewer 2

General comments:

Kaan Orhan (Reviewer 2): The corrections that was demanded by this reviewer was made, thus can be accepted as an original contribution.

Response: We sincerely thank Prof. Kaan Orhan for spending time reviewing our manuscript carefully and agreeing to accept our paper for publication in BMC Medical Imaging.