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Reviewer’s report:

This is a relatively small case series of children with simple bone cysts.

I enjoyed reading it, and thought the background and introduction were comprehensive and interesting.

I found it peculiar that the authors commenced their Results section with their recurrence and complication data. One would normally broadcast one's successes first.

And indeed there is no real mention of the successful cases.

They then go on to discuss how these recurrences were managed, which was not really within the remit or objectives of the study. To begin state that all their revision surgery was successful then undermines any strong conclusion about their original treatment methodology (i.e., maybe actually bone grafting and curettage does not work - 40% failure rates, while methylpred and fibular grafting with en bloc excision works without fail). I would leave out the section about how the revisions were managed, completely.

I think the results section needs to be re-written and restructured; as does the Results section in the Abstract.

It would be interesting for the authors to comment on why they treated their cases with just curettage and grafting, rather than with additional chemical resection. When recurrence rates are so much greater and this has been known from the literature for some time. 40% vs 15% respectively in the 1980s. They achieved similar results in 2000s.

Despite statistical analyses it is difficult to draw true conclusions about which cysts should be treated by curettage and grafting, when their results are similar to those in the literature in which others papers report on diverse populations of patients with diverse cyst locations, with similar outcomes (which might suggest that factors other than those analysed may also be in play). Lines 176-178 thus are not strictly accurate.

Lines 159-161. Conclusions should not be in the Results section!

Some of the Discussion is repetitive and could be cut down significantly.
Also the commentary about the techniques the clinic is using in the 2010s is not relevant to the paper. Are they writing about their case series or about different patients.

Lines 188-195 should be removed entirely.

Lines 198-203 are already in the Introduction and don't need to be repeated.

Lines 204-207 don't relate to the cases in this series or the technique that was used, and should be removed.

Line 138 "en block" should be "en bloc"

I think that the paper is interesting, but the conclusions cannot be drawn strongly. All one can say is that there are association between the analysed factors (no causative link).
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