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Reviewer’s report:

The writing can be tightened significantly (all sections) to make the manuscript read more easily.

BACKGROUND:

- Recommend providing more detail i.e. numbness from referenced studies to support statements in the background section. For example, descriptions such as "low numbers" and small patient samples are vague.

METHODS: recommend to simply describe the methodology, without adding descriptors / explanations on how these methods may impact the analysis. Can move these explanations to the discussion section.

- Probably not necessary to describe the history of the SEER database.

- Recommend more clearly defining "solitary plasmacytoma", used to screen/select patients to include in this study.

STATISTICS:

- would be interesting if you have any outcomes of PFS, developing more systemic disease / multiple myeloma

- please provide more descriptors (i.e. percentages in addition to p value) when describing outcomes.

PATIENT CHARACTERISTICS:

- State results without interpretation. You comment on the prevalence of plasmacytomas in different races, but the data only comes from SEER and not worldwide.

- There are some sentences re stats and methodology mixed in this section.
CONCLUSIONS: would soften the language regarding the role/benefits of surgery in treating plasmacytomas

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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