Author's response to reviews

Title: Prognostic factors for survival in patients with malignant pleural effusions. What is considered important for treatment?

Authors:

Mauro M Zamboni (mauro.zamboni@gmail.com)
Cyro T Silva Jr (ctsilvajunior@predialnet.com.br)
Rodrigo Baretta (rodrigobaretta@hotmail.com)
Edson T Cunha (edsontoscano@gmail.com)
Gilberto P Cardoso (gilpcard@globo.com)

Version: 3 Date: 30 December 2014

Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Dr. Atsushi:

I am pleased to submit an original Research Article entitled “Prognostic factors for survival in patients with malignant pleural effusions. What is considered important for treatment?” by Mauro Musa Zamboni; Cyro Teixeira da Silva Jr; Rodrigo Baretta; Edson Toscano Cunha; and Gilberto Perez Cardoso for consideration for publication in the BMC Pulmonary Medicine.

As requested by the reviewers, I am sending you a new version of our paper with the changes highlighted in red.

Reviewer 1: Lisete Teixeira

1. Major Revisions
   a) The paper was rebuilt with all the considerations done by the reviewers.
   b) We condensed the first and second paragraphs. (lines 71-72)
   c) The authors clarified “What means biochemical classification of malign pleural fluids?” adding a new reference.
   d) Done
   e) We modified the “Results section” and we condensed last and 4th paragraphs.
      Discussion Section
   f) We modified the first phrase in the 3rd paragraph (line 234)
   g) We summarized the 4th paragraph excluding TNM details
   h) The 5th and 6th paragraphs was rewritten (lines 262-284)
   i) The explanation about the Cox Model was removed from the Discussion section
   j) In the 1st line of the 10th paragraph the word “also” was removed
   k) The authors did a careful revision of the Discussion Section

2. Minor Essential Revision
   a. The authors dis a careful correction of spelling and grammatical of all text.
   b. All the suggestions about legend and figures were done, as suggested by the Reviewer

3. Discretionary Revisions
   a. The recommendations were taken.
Reviewer 2: Amelia Clive

1. Major Compulsory Revisions
   A) Abstract - Done
   B) Methods
      a. Done
      b. Done
      c. Done
      d. We rewrite the sentence.
   C) Regarding Figures and Tables – The authors did all modifications in accordance with the reviewer’s suggestions.
   D) Discussion
      a. The section regarding lung cancer staging was rewritten.
      b. This paragraph was included
      c. The study by Anvlavis et al. was cited in our paper (ref. 24). The authors included the 2 others papers.
      d. The authors included the papers regarding the use of IPCs.

2. Minor Essential Revisions
   a. The first sentence of the abstract was modified
   b. Done

3. Discretionary Revisions
   a. ECOG PS was presented as Table 1
   b. The explanation about the Cox Model was removed from the Discussion section
   c. We did this

The authors would like to acknowledge the contributions, comments and suggestions from the reviewers. All of them were of great help in drawing up our paper.

Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mauro M. Zamboni