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Author’s response to reviews:

June 26, 2017

Editorial Board

BMC Endocrine Disorders
e-Submission

Dear BMC Endocrine Disorders Editorial Board:

My co-authors and I have previously submitted our original research article, “Long-term Treatment Outcomes of Acromegaly Patients Presenting with Uncontrolled Disease at a Tertiary Pituitary Center” for publication in BMC Endocrine Disorders (Manuscript #BEND-D-17-00118). We have received a request to make minor revisions to the manuscript.
We have addressed each comment raised by the reviewers and made clarifications in the manuscript as requested. Our specific responses to the comments are attached below. In response to the reviewers’ comments, we have specified the sections for our corresponding revisions in the manuscript and quoted text where reviewers’ comments were addressed. My co-authors and I would like to sincerely thank the BMC Endocrine Disorders editorial board and the reviewers for their review of our manuscript.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to your decision.

Sincerely,
Dasha Cherepanov, Ph.D.
Director, Outcomes Research
Partnership for Health Analytic Research, LLC,
280 S. Beverly Drive, Suite 404, Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Email: dasha@PHARLLC.com
Phone: 310 858-9555
Fax: 310 858-9552

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Manuscript number: # BEND-D-17-00118

Title: Long-term Treatment Outcomes of Acromegaly Patients Presenting with Uncontrolled Disease at a Tertiary Pituitary Center

EDITOR COMMENTS

1. [Editor Comment] In the Ethics approval and consent to participate section of the Declarations please clarify whether written or verbal informed consent was obtained from all participants. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure.
Written informed consent was obtained from all subjects that participated in the registry. We have clarified this as followings in the manuscript (page 15):

“Ethics approval and consent to participate: The study was approved by the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center Institutional Review Board. Written informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.”

2. [Editor Comment] We note that you state “Data are not available” in the Availability of data and materials section. Please could you provide a justification why the data are not available.

[Authors’ response] The raw data are not available for public access because the registry data are part of the patient medical records at the site. Thus, the raw data are only available to the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center clinicians and staff that are legally able to access patient medical records.

We have clarified this section on page 15 accordingly as follows:

“Availability of data and material: Raw data are not available for public use. These data are only available to the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center staff that legally has access to these patient data.”

3. [Editor Comment] We note that some phrases, for example “EC conducted the statistical analyses” have been repeated in the Authors’ contributions section. Please thoroughly check this section and ensure that any repeated phrases have been removed.

[Authors’ response] All repeated phrases have been removed from the Authors’ contributions section.

The text was changed as follows, by deleting the statement in strike-through (page 16):

“All authors were involved in the design of the study, interpretation of results, and writing of the manuscript. Additionally, JDC, AM, and VB participated in data acquisition and EC conducted the statistical analyses. All authors met the ICMJE criteria for authorship. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.”