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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to the Editor and the Reviewers

Dear Hayley Henderson:

Thank you very much for your letter and the comments about our paper (“Hormone deprivation therapy based on parathyroidectomy causes tumoral calcinosis to shrink in uremic patients with secondary hyperparathyroidism”; BSUR-D-19-00208R1) submitted to BMC Surgery. According to the reviewer’s suggestion; the previous title was replaced by “Effects of parathyroidectomy on tumoral calcinosis in uremic patients with secondary hyperparathyroidism”. We deeply appreciate the careful reading of our manuscript and valuable suggestions from both the editor and the reviewers.

After carefully studying the comments and advice. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in
the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as following:

Claudio Gambardella, MD (Reviewer 1):

Claudio Gambardella, MD (Reviewer 1): Thanks for accepting my suggestion the paper is suitable for publication in its present form

We deeply appreciate to your positive decision.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2): PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)? Yes - there is a clear objective. DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective? Yes - the approach is appropriate. EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results? N/A - no experiments or analyses. STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate? Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study. INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated? Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable. OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound? Probably - with minor revisions

We deeply appreciate the positive comments from the peer reviewer. We take a point-by-point response at revised manuscript.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors had answered all my comments and had done the suggested changes. The article in its current form is suitable for publication.

We very much appreciate the reviewer’s comment.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

I would suggest changing the title of the manuscript to a short one. Also, to improve the title to a more native English way.
We deeply appreciated the reviewer’s suggestion. The previous title was replaced by “Effects of parathyroidectomy on tumoral calcinosis in uremic patients with secondary hyperparathyroidism”. Please let us know it is suitable for publication?