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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Valentina Pinzi,

We are submitting the revised manuscript with the ID NURL-D-18-00509R1, entitled "The therapeutic value of cerebrospinal fluid ctDNA detection by Next-Generation Sequencing for meningeal carcinomatosis: a case report" for publication in BMC Neurology. According to the comments, we have already revised the manuscript. All revisions have been marked in red in the revised manuscript. The following are our reply to the comments, item by item.

Once again, thank you for your kind reconsideration.

Yours sincerely,

Hui Bu
Technical Comments:

1. Figures:
Please upload figures as figure files.
Answer: We thank the Reviewer for his/her kind evaluation of our work. As suggested, we will upload figures as figure files. Thanks!

2. Figure legends:
Figure legends must be included in the main manuscript text file at the end of the document, rather than being a part of the figure file. For each figure or table, the following information should be provided: Figure or table number (in sequence, using Arabic numerals - i.e. Figure 1, 2, 3 etc); short title of figure or table (maximum 15 words); detailed legend, up to 300 words.
Answer: We thank the Reviewer for his/her kind evaluation of our work. As suggested, we have put the figure legends in the main manuscript text file at the end of the document and marked in red in the “Figure legends” section (Page 14 line 8-44) of the revised manuscript. In addition, we have provided the figure number as suggested. And the word count of the short title of figure and detailed legend was within the specified range. Thanks!

Editor Comments:

Although the authors have revised the manuscript according to the reviewers’ suggestion, there are some further drawbacks that should be addressed.

Firstly, specify the acronymus (EGFR, gDNA, QIAamp).
Answer: We thank the Reviewer for his/her kind evaluation of our work. As suggested, we have specified the acronyms of EGFR, gDNA and QIAamp. All changes have been marked in red in the “Abstract” (Page 1 line 13), “Introduction” (Page 4 line 8-10), “2.1 Sample” (Page 4 line 55-57) sections of the revised manuscript. Thanks!

Page 4 line 55 and page 5 line 11: is this ctDNA instead of cfDNA? If cfDNA explain it.
Answer: We thank the Reviewer for his/her kind evaluation of our work. It is cfDNA. We have explained and marked in red in the “2.1 Sample” (Page 4 line 55) section of the revised manuscript. Thanks!

Secondly, please better explain the line 1 pag 5: what pressure did you control? How?
Answer: We thank the Reviewer for his/her kind evaluation of our work. In fact, we controlled the pressure of vacuum pump. The calibration of the vacuum pump was firstly set to the maximum and then slowly set to 0. We have added the content and marked in red in the “2.1 Sample” (Page 5 line 8-14) section of the revised manuscript. Thanks!

Moreover, it would be better to clearly explain the passages in page 5 lines 28-33: the concentration of
An effective fragment was… Illumina NextSeq 500 System.

Answer: We thank the Reviewer for his/her kind evaluation of our work. We are sorry for the unclear description of the method. We have clearly explained the passages and marked in red in the “2.1 Sample” (Page 5 line 30-35) section of the revised manuscript. Thanks!

Thirdly, correct “assembly” with “assembled” (pag 5 line 46) and explain “fastq”.

Answer: We thank the Reviewer for his/her kind evaluation of our work. We are sorry for our poor English writing. As suggested, we have correct “assembly” with “assembled”. In addition, fastq is the file format of raw data of sequencing. All changes have been marked in red in the “2.2 Genomic analysis” section (Page 5 line 49) of the revised manuscript. Thanks!

Correct the first period of “case presentation” section: this is a case report and it would be better to eliminate “a man … was included”.

Answer: We thank the Reviewer for his/her kind evaluation of our work. As suggested, we have eliminated the sentence. Thanks!

Page 5 Line 35, please substitute “mental symptoms” with “neurological symptoms”.

Answer: We thank the Reviewer for his/her kind evaluation of our work. We are sorry for our poor English writing. As suggested, we have substitute “mental symptoms” with “neurological symptoms” and marked in red in the “Case presentation” section (Page 6 line 35) of the revised manuscript. Thanks!

Lastly, despite the authors have revised the manuscript, English language needs to be professionally edited.

Answer: We thank the Reviewer for his/her kind evaluation of our work. We are sorry for our poor English writing. As suggested, we have edited the English language professionally. All changes have been marked in red (Page 2 line 8-10, 13-19, 24-27, 30, 35 and 41; Page 3 line 24, 44, 58-60; Page 4 line 5-13, 30, 55-58; Page 5 line 8-13, 30-35, 41-46, 55 and 60; Page 6 line 5-13, 24-27, 33-38 and 44-60; Page 7 line 5-10, 19, 24, 33-35 and 44; Page 8 line 5-16, 25-27 and 35-49; Page 4 line 55, Page 4 line 55, Page 4 line 55, Page 4 line 55, Page 4 line 55, Page 4 line 55, Page 4 line 55, Page 4 line 55, Page 4 line 55, Page 4 line 55, Page 4 line 55, Page 4 line 55,) in the revised manuscript. Thanks!