Author’s response to reviews

Title: Treatment, Outcomes, and Demographics in Sinonasal Sarcoma: a Systematic Review of the Literature

Authors:
Mitchell Gore (mgoremdphd@gmail.com)

Version: 2 Date: 07 Feb 2018

Author's response to reviews:

ENTD-D-17-00036R1

Treatment, Outcomes, and Demographics in Sinonasal Sarcoma: a Systematic Review of the Literature

Mitchell Gore, M.D. Ph.D.

BMC Ear, Nose and Throat Disorders

I greatly appreciate the thoughtful and insightful comments provided by the reviewers, and my point by point response is provided below.

Sincerely,

Mitchell R. Gore MD PhD

Technical Comments:
Editor Comments:

Dear author,

I would like to thank you for submission of your paper to BMC Ear, Nose and Throat Disorders.

External peer-reviewer reports and my comments are here. Please revise the paper at earliest time due to comments.

=> Please review carefully the instructions for authors of our journal before submission of revised manuscript.

https://bmcearnosethroatdisord.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines

The paper(127,509),(864,966) is aims to review of manuscript on sinonasal sarcoma in the literature. It is well written and well designed. I recommended some changes through the paper;

The quality of English; Acceptable but needs some revisions. Please assess the language of your paper carefully.

I have carefully reviewed the entire paper and corrected the spelling and syntax errors found.

1-Title is suitable but in the study the demographic datas were discussed, the title was not reflected the study adequately. Please amend the title compatible with study content.

Page 1 I have revised the title to “Treatment, Outcomes, and Demographics in Sinonasal Sarcoma: a Systematic Review of the Literature”

2-Background should be improved with current literature knowledges. Especially, potential etiological factors, diagnostic challenges, treatment modalities and follow-up period...

Page 2 and 3, Under Background, first and second paragraph, I have added a discussion of the etiological factors (genetics, associated diseases, radiation, Epstein-Barr virus, etc.) associated with sarcoma, and a discussion of the diagnostic challenges, treatment modalities, and follow-up period.
3- The need for such a study should be mentioned background.

Page 3, the third paragraph under Background I have noted the need for the study due to the relative lack of literature on survival outcomes in sinonasal sarcoma, especially the less frequent histopathological subtypes.

4- I think there are too many unnecessary references, please remove the unnecessary references from the paper.

The vast majority of the references are necessary to properly credit the authors whose studies were used to conduct the meta-analysis, and the remainder are necessary to properly credit the studies from whom the background information was gleaned. I am hesitant to remove these references as that would make it difficult for future researchers to identify relevant studies for future meta-analyses on sinonasal sarcoma.

5- Figures should be decreased and improved.

I have improved the labeling of the figures and made them easier to read. I am hesitant to decrease the number of figures as this would eliminate vital survival outcome data, and combining the overall and disease-free survival curves made the figures more difficult to read.

6- I recommended that some tables which were reflected the study data to clarity, only figures make difficulty to understand paper.

Page 4 under Results: Demographics I have added tables 1, 2, and 3 which list the patient sex/TNM/overall stage demographics, tumor types, and treatment types, respectively.

7- What is the clinical implications of the study?

Page 8, paragraph 5 (final paragraph under Discussion) I have added a paragraph discussing the treatment type, tumor type, cervical node treatment, and surgery type clinical implications.

8- You should discuss the strength of study in discussion.

Page 8, paragraph 5 (final paragraph under Discussion) I have added a discussion of the strengths of the study.
9- What is your recommendations for future studies about sinonasal sarcoma to authors?

Page 8, paragraph 5 (final paragraph under Discussion) I have added a discussion of recommendations for future prospective, population-based, and single-tumor-type studies.

BMC Ear, Nose and Throat Disorders operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

FATİH OĞHAN (Reviewer 1): Accept

Satvinder Bakshi, MS (Reviewer 2): Well written article

The Result section is very confusing and can be better represented in a tabular form, especially the demographic part and site of tumor

Page 4 under Results: Demographics I have added tables 1, 2, and 3 which list the patient sex/TNM/overall stage demographics, tumor types, and treatment types, respectively.

The figures are a bit confusing and better labeling of the x and y axis along with the units can be done in order to make them clear.

I have improved the labeling of the figures and made them easier to read and labeled the x and y axes more clearly.

Can the disease free survival and overall survival figures be clubbed into a single figure?
Especially for the figures comparing several groups combining the overall and disease-free survival curves made the figures very difficult to read.

Can we assess the survival in terms of site of tumor, whether arising from the nose or maxillary or other sinuses?

Unfortunately, the vast majority of the patients had tumor sites that included multiple subsites (for example maxillary sinus, nasal cavity, ethmoid, and sphenoid). This precluded a clear analysis of survival by tumor site.

The development of recurrence also has a prognostic role, can that be assessed?

Page 4, first paragraph under Results: Survival Analysis I have added an analysis of the effect of recurrence on relative survival, which showed a statistically significantly higher relative survival for patients who did not experience a recurrence vs. patients who experienced a recurrence.

If improvements to the English language within your manuscript have been requested, you should have your manuscript reviewed by someone who is fluent in English. If you would like professional help in revising this manuscript, you can use any reputable English language editing service. We can recommend our affiliates Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES_BS) and American Journal Experts (http://bit.ly/AJE_BS) for help with English usage. Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our English language tutorial (https://www.springer.com/gb/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/writinginenglish) and our Writing resources (http://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/writing-resources). These cover common mistakes that occur when writing in English.

Editorial Policies

Please read the following information and revise your manuscript as necessary. If your manuscript does not adhere to our editorial requirements this will cause a delay whilst the issue is addressed. Failure to adhere to our policies may result in rejection of your manuscript.
In accordance with BioMed Central editorial policies and formatting guidelines, all submissions to BMC Ear, Nose and Throat Disorders must have a Declarations section which includes the mandatory sub-sections listed below. Please refer to the journal's Submission Guidelines webpage for information regarding the criteria for each sub-section (https://bmcearnosethroatdisord.biomedcentral.com/).

Where a mandatory section is not relevant to your study design or article type, for example, if your manuscript does not contain any individual persons data, please write "Not applicable" in these sections.

For the 'Availability of data and materials' section, please provide information about where the data supporting your findings can be found. We encourage authors to deposit their datasets in publicly available repositories (where available and appropriate), or to be presented within the manuscript and/or additional supporting files. Please note that identifying/confidential patient data should not be shared. Authors who do not wish to share their data must state that data will not be shared, and provide reasons for this in the manuscript text. For further guidance on how to format this section, please refer to BioMed Central's editorial policies page - http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#availability+of+data+and+materials.
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