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BMC cancer

RE: Re-submission of our manuscript (#BCAN-D-18-00105R1)

Dear Editor,

Many thanks for your email. We also thank the reviewer and their constructive suggestions and comments. We have revised our manuscript accordingly and would like to re-submit it for your consideration. Our point-by-point answers to the reviewers’ comments are attached below and
the amendments are highlighted in yellow in the revised manuscript, and other changes such as grammar, spelling, and syntax using track changes. We also have removed the certificate for editing in the supplementary file and the participant’s details in Figure 3. Authors' names have revised using their full initials in the Authors’ Contributions section

We hope that the revised manuscript is now acceptable, and I am looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Xiaoying Xue, MD
Professor and Chief
Department of radiotherapy, the Second Hospital of Hebei Medical University, Shijiazhuang, 050000, China
Tel.: +86-24-66003816; Fax: +86-24-66003816; E-mail: xxy6412@163.com.

Our responses to the reviewers’ comments

Reviewer #1

Isaac Chen (Reviewer 1): The authors addressed the majority of my prior comments in the revised manuscript. The syntax and grammar have been improved. However, several syntax/grammatical errors remain, and the manuscript does not read smoothly.

We thank the reviewer. This manuscript has been edited and proofread again.
Additional comments:

- Some statement that long-term radiographic imaging would be helpful to further assess the efficacy of radiation therapy for this diagnosis should be included.

We fully agree and have added this in the Discussion and Conclusions section, the third paragraph, line 4-6, page 6.

- It is still not quite clear from the manuscript (Discussion) whether the authors are attributing elevations in tumor markers to the PICH of the skull or the potential recurrent breast cancer.

We fully understand the reviewer’s concern, and have added this information in the Discussion and Conclusions section, the fourth paragraph, line 4, page 7.

- Figure 5 legend should state the timing of the scan (i.e., that it was performed at the end of radiation therapy)

We thank the reviewer and the suggestion, and have added this information in figure caption of Fig.5.