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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Editors:

1. In the Ethics and consent to participate section please clarify whether consent to participate was obtained from participants. Please also include whether the consent was written or verbal. If the consent was verbal please include reasoning for this and state if an IRB approved this method of obtaining consent. If consent was not required, please include a statement on whether the need for consent was waived by an IRB or if national guidelines have established that studies such as this do not require consent, along with a reference to the relevant legislation.

Response:

Thanks for your comments. We got the approved certificate for our study by our institutional review board. After getting the approved certificate, we started to make a phone call to inform that CT scan of the patient was used in our study. If the patient understands and agrees, we might include the image for our study. If the patient disagrees, we might exclude the image for further measurements. We got the proved certificate (2017-10-008BC) from our institute and got the verbal approval from the patients with a phone call. IRB approved certificate number (2017-10-008BC) was added in the line 9, page 7 in the material section.
2. Please clarify in the cover letter whether the images in Figure 1A & 1B are your own or are from another source. If from another source please acknowledge the source in the figure legend, and if it is under copyright also state the written permission given to use and adapt it.

If the above conditions are not met the image needs to be removed. Please note the editors may request proof of permission at any time. Should you require an alternative source you may wish to try Wikimedia Commons: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Main_Page

Response:

Thanks for your comments. The figure 1A and 1B were hand-made by one of the authors (P.H.C.) with painting software in the notebook. We designed the figure by ourselves. We did not copy the full image from other sources.

3. Please remove the response to reviewers from the file inventory, as it is no longer needed at this stage of the editorial process.

Response:

Thanks for your comments. We will follow the recommendation. We removed the response to reviewers from the file inventory.

4. Please change “institutional review broad” to “institutional review board”. If a reference number was provided, please include that in the Ethics approval section as well.

Response:

Thanks for your comments. The typo “broad” was changed to “board” in the line 8, page 7 in the material section. We also added the IRB approved certificate number (2017-10-008BC) in the line 9, page 7 in the material section.

5. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colors. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Response:

Thanks for your comments. We will follow your recommendation.

Best regards,
Po-Hsin Chou