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Editor-in-Chief

BMC Surgery

Dear Executive Editor

Dr. Tom Rowles

Re: MS: 1568770131701210 “Partial mastectomy using manual blunt dissection (MBD) in early breast cancer”

We greatly appreciate your invitation for us to re-submit our article. We would like to thank you for a number of comments and suggestions for improvement in our manuscript entitled “Partial mastectomy using manual blunt dissection (MBD) in early breast cancer” by Kashiwagi S et al.

We have carefully considered the referee’s comments and have made point-by-point responses as described below, and highlighted in the revised manuscript.

I hope this revised manuscript can again be considered for publication in the BMC Surgery.

Sincerely,

Shinichiro Kashiwagi, MD

Department of Surgical Oncology, Osaka City University Graduate School of Medicine,
1-4-3 Asahi-machi, Abeno-ku, Osaka 545-8585, Japan
TEL: (+81) 6-6645-3838
FAX: (+81) 6-6646-6450
e-mail address: spqv9ke9@view.ocn.ne.jp
We have responded to the comments from Referee #1, as follows:

Referee #1

Dear Mark Trombetta

⇒ Thank you very much for the careful review of the reviewer. We correct several points according to the descriptions by the reviewer, as follows.

Reviewer’s report:

Overall this article is much improved, but English and grammar require revision throughout before publication.

⇒ We are sorry for your inconvenience. We asked native check over the whole paper and proofread an English sentence.

(Forte Science Communications, Job No. R1507260)
We have responded to the comments from Referee #2, as follows:

Referee #2
Dear Edward Chang

Reviewer’s report:
The authors have performed some additional revisions which have indeed strengthened the paper, particularly the included section on the rating of the cosmetic outcomes.

⇒ Thank you very much for the careful review of the reviewer. We correct several points according to the descriptions by the reviewer, as follows.

Major Criticisms
Why did the authors choose to ask a breast surgeon and patient to perform the rating of the cosmetic outcomes? Why not more raters? Was the rating performed before or after completion of radiation? Was there any bias or was the rating blinded? For example, the evaluators should be given photos of patients with the technique as well as patients who did not receive the technique to avoid bias.

⇒ Thank you for your detailed review. We are sorry for our inappropriate descriptions. The evaluation in the beauty evaluates satisfaction of patient oneself. A breast surgeon explains "Four points of evaluations of Harvard". And we did the evaluation in beauty after radiotherapy treatment as final assessment. This examination is not blind for retrospective study. Cosmesis was evaluated after Bp using a patient-based tool, the "Four points of evaluation of Harvard" [7]. (Lines 77-78)

Minor Revisions
The included revisions need to be corrected for grammar and spelling.

⇒ We are sorry for you inconvenience. We asked native check over the whole paper and proofread an English sentence.

(Forte Science Communications, Job No. R1507260)