Iranian Journal of Radiology
Volume 20 · Issue 3 · e128065

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Therapeutic Effects of CT-guided Microwave Ablation Combined with Cementoplasty in the Treatment of Bone Metastasis

Bin Hao, Jian Ma, Ningjun Wan, Shaowei Xu, Zhen Wang

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
20 May 2022	19 May 2023	1 Nov 2023	10.5812/ijradiol-128065

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Editor-in-Chief 3

2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 4

Authors' reply to reviewers 5

Reviewer and editor comments 6

3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief 7

Authors' reply to reviewers 8

Reviewer and editor comments 9

4 **Revision 3** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 10

Authors' reply to reviewers 11

Reviewer and editor comments 16

5 **Revision 4** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 18

Authors' reply to reviewers 19

Reviewer and editor comments 20

6 **Revision 5** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 21

Authors' reply to reviewers 22

Reviewer and editor comments 23

7 **Revision 6** Editor-in-Chief 24

Authors' reply to reviewers 25

Reviewer and editor comments 29

8 **Revision 7** Editor-in-Chief 30

Authors' reply to reviewers 31

Reviewer and editor comments 32

1 Original submission

1 comment · 21 May 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 21 May 2022

Dear authors,
Before starting the review process for your article, it is necessary to clarify the following items:

-Please mention the ethical approval code and provide the corresponding link. If the web address (link) for the ethics committee approval is not available, please upload the official approval document from the ethics committee.

-Given the importance of “conflict of interest” clarification, the corresponding author should fill out the “ICMJE form” and upload it during the submission process. (The form is available in the “conflict of interest” section of the site:
https://brief.land/iranjradiol/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#conflicts_of_interest.html).

-Please upload the patients’ informed consent.

Regards

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

> EIC Decision:

Dear authors,
Before starting the review processing of your article, it is necessary to clarify the following items:

-Please mention the ethical approval code with the link address. If the web address (link) of ethical committee approval is not available, please upload the official approval document ethics committee.

-Regarding the importance of "conflict of interest" clarification, the corresponding author should fill out the "ICMJE form" form and upload in the submission process. (The form exists in "conflict of interest" section of the site: https://brief.land/iranjradiol/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#conflicts_of_interest.html).

-Please upload the informed consent of the patients.

Regards

Response: We have uploaded the file, Thank you.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 25 May 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 25 May 2022

Dear authors,
Please mention the ethical code and provide the corresponding web address. If the web address (link) for ethics committee approval is not available, please upload the official approval document from the ethics committee.
Regards

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

> EIC Decision:

Dear authors,
Please mention the ethical code with the link address. If the web address (link) of ethical committee approval is not available, please upload the official approval document ethics committee.
Regards

Response: We have uploaded the file, Thank you.

3 Revision 2

2 comments · 18 Jul 2022 – 24 Jul 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 18 Jul 2022

Dear Authors
Many sentences and paragraphs are unclear. The paper has been written in poor English. It seems to be a source of misunderstanding. Please rewrite the article in fluent English.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 24 Jul 2022

Dear authors,
Your article needs Major Revision.
regards

4

Revision 3

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Dear Editorial

According to Manuscript ID: 119219

Clinical efficacy of CT-mediated microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty in the therapy of bone metastases[Revision 1]

The reviewers commented as:

Reviewer# 1

the authors have corrected many parts but there are some points to be addressed as below:

The quality of writing is not appropriate and the paper needs a huge work in this regard. please advise with an expert English editor.

1-as the study is not a randomized trial, the term “Clinical efficacy” seems somehow stronger than the design of study. It is recommended the authors replace this term with milder terms, such as treatment effects or treatment benefits o somethings like previously mentioned terms. Please follow this recommendation in all paper.

Respond: the term “Clinical efficacy” is replaced by “treatment effects”.

2-please add objective part [as a separate title] to paper according to journal format.

Respond: we have added objective part to paper according to journal format.

4-please add manufacturer data of SPSS program. [based on IBM website]

Respond: we have added the manufacturer data of SPSS program.

5-in lines 152 and 153, please delete this part: “a one-way analysis of variance is used to analyze the data changes the pretreatment and posttreatment within the group”

Respond: “a one-way analysis of variance is used to analyze the data changes the pretreatment and posttreatment within the group” has been deleted.

6-please delete all “Number of” in table 1.

Respond: we have deleted all “Number of” in table 1.

6-what is the number 30 in “30 Number of other
places metastasis” in table 1? In addition what is 21 in “21 Table1- …” and 18 in “18 Maximum diameter of metastases(cm)” and 19 in “19 Pathological type of primary lesion” and 20 in “20 Thoracic spine”? please correct all of these numbers.

Respond: we have deleted the number in table 1.

7-the authors mentioned: “Pathological type of primary lesion” but they have mentioned totally 7 cases [adenocarcinoma 3+Neuroendocrine carcinoma 2 and Squamous cell carcinoma 2]. What are other 13 metastases?

Respond: other 13 metastases are malignant bone tumors

8-what is the meaning of position in Metastasis position in table 1? Does it mean the location of metastases other than bone metastases? Please clarify.

Respond: it mean the location of metastases other than bone metastases

9-the authors mentioned in figure 1 QLQ-BM22B that seems to be QLQ-BM22.

Respond: QLQ-BM22B in figure 1 has been replaced with the QLQ-BM22.

10-this part is unclear: “P>0.05 versus pretreatment median EQ-5D score.” Is this a sentence? Please complete and correct.

Respond: we have complete and correct by “The difference between median EQ-5D score pretreatment and posttreatment is no significant (P>0.05).”

11-in line 183, figure 1 is wrong. It is figure 2.

Respond: the “figure 1” has been replaced by “figure 2”

12-i asked the authors to add what is details of comparisons between time sessions but they have not responded this point. The differences of QALY and QLQ-BM22 are significant but we don’t know this differences are between which times? For example between pre and 1 month? O between 1 month and 6 months and so on. This analysis needs statistical consultation. Significant P value in QALY could be due to difference between 1 week and pre-treatment [not between pre-treatment and 6 months]. So I asked the authors to add this data to paper.

Respond: The QALY posttreatment, QLQ-BM22 posttreatment, QALY posttreatment are The QALY (6 months posttreatment), QLQ-BM22 (6 months posttreatment), QALY (6 months posttreatment), respectively.

Reviewer#2

Please mention ethical code with the link address.

Respond: we have clinked the link to complete the ethical code “this study was approved by the ethics committee of our hospital”.

Please clarify the financial resource and mention the number grant.

Respond: this study does not receive any financial support.

Regarding the importance of “conflict of interest” clarification, corresponding author should fill the “ICMJ form” form and upload in the submission process. (The form

exists in “conflict of interest” section of the site: https://brief.land/iranjradiol/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#conflicts_of_interest.html).

Respond: the authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Please upload the informed consent form of patients.

Respond: the informed consent form of patients is obtained from all the participants and has been uploaded.

Reviewer#3

Thanks to the authors for submitting their work to the IJR.

Regarding this manuscript, it should be said that it has major defects in terms of scientific writing structure, English writing, and statistical analysis that mentioned in detail in below:

1. Do not use a randomized clinical trial design, while the purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the treatment method.

Respond: we have corrected the randomized clinical trial design with “this clinical study”.

2. Small sample size of the study: Studies with a larger sample size can be seen in the literature. As a result, items 1 and 2 should be mentioned as study limitations at the end of the discussion.

Respond: we have added the “Small sample size of the study as study limitations” to end of the discussion.

3. The study design is retrospective cohort, but the results reported as a case series study. As a result, it is necessary to rewrite the results of the abstract and full text using the template article entitled "Use of percutaneous microwave ablation for the treatment of bone tumors: a retrospective study of clinical outcomes in 47 patients".

Respond: we have corrected the article entitled “Treatment effects of CT-mediated microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty in the therapy of bone metastases ”.

4. The section on ethical considerations and informed consent should be fully explained in the method section. In addition, the code of ethics should be mentioned as a hyperlink.

Respond: we have explained the section on ethical considerations and informed consent in the method section and the code of ethics has been set a hyperlink.

5. The method section should be written as subheadings.

Respond: The method section has be written as subheadings

6. The study manuscript should be written using STROBE guideline for cohort studies.

Respond: we have corrected the manuscript according to the STROBE guideline.

7. The method section should explain the main and secondary outcomes, follow-up, and loss to follow-up.

Respond: we have explained the main and secondary outcomes, follow-up, and loss to follow-up.

8. Many English spelling and grammatical errors are seen in the text.

Respond: we have corrected the English spelling and grammatical errors in the manuscript.

9. The statistical analysis part is wrong. Study data are dependent and appropriate tests should be used depending on the purpose and normal distribution of data. In addition, the writing style of the statistical analysis section is incorrect; the statistical analysis section should be written in a practical way, not theoretically and in a book form.

Respond: we have corrected the statistical analysis part.

10. The results section was not well reported. It is necessary to emphasize again that the manuscript should be fully edited using by after mentioned template paper and STROBE guideline.

Respond: we have corrected the results section.

11. For the figures, first of all, a significant level should be reported, and secondly, the acronyms should be written completely below the figure. Furthermore, why was the median of the values used and the mean not used? Why the results of repeated measures analysis of variance or Friedman, which were stated in the statistical analysis section, not reported?

Respond: a significant level has been reported and the acronyms have been written completely below the figure. The median value has been deleted and Friedman P has been added.

12. The follow-up time of patients should also be reported in Table 1.

Respond: we have added the follow-up time of patients in Table 1.

13. Tumor pathology variable (benign or malignant) played an important role in the outcomes but was not considered?

Respond: Thanks for your comment, tumor pathology in previous study has been reported.

15. Indicators such as VAS score were used in most studies but were not reported in your study?

Respond: Thanks for your comment. In our next larger sample study, VAS score will be used.

16. The conclusion section should be added after the full text discussion.

Respond: we have added the conclusion after the full text discussion.

4 Revision 3

3 comments · 20 Aug 2022 – 15 Oct 2022

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 20 Aug 2022

Although some revisions were made, not all previous comments were addressed correctly. Therefore, the following points should be addressed appropriately:
1. Why was a randomized clinical trial design not used, given that the purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the treatment method?
2. The number of patients with bone metastasis who were treated with CT-mediated microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty is given as 20 in the methods section but as 47 in the title.
3. This sentence "The main outcome aims to compare the effectiveness of CT-mediated microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty" is unclear, and the comparison group was not specified.
4. The scientific writing structure and English editing of the manuscript are not appropriate. The manuscript must be revised according to the STROBE guideline, especially in the results section of the abstract. The abstract results should focus on the questionnaire results. Moreover, wherever a value is compared between two time points/groups, the value for each time point should be presented, along with the p-value in parentheses.
5. The tumor pathology variable (benign or malignant) played an important role in the outcomes but was not considered? Your response is not acceptable because this factor is very important and should be considered in each study.
6. 15. Indicators such as the VAS score were used in most studies but were not reported in your study? Your response is not useful for this study.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 12 Oct 2022

Although some editing was done, not all previous comments were addressed correctly. Therefore, the following points should be addressed appropriately:
1. Why wasn't a randomized clinical trial design used, given that the purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the treatment method?
2. The number of patients with bone metastasis who were treated with CT-mediated microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty is given as 20 in the methods but as 47 in the title.
3. The sentence "The main outcome aims to compare the effectiveness of CT-mediated microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty" is unclear, and the comparison group wasn't specified.
4. The scientific writing structure and English editing of the manuscript aren't appropriate. The manuscript must be revised according to the STROBE guideline, especially in the results section of the abstract. The abstract results should focus on the questionnaire results. Moreover, wherever a value is compared between two times/groups, the value for each time/group should be presented, along with the p-value in parentheses.
5. The tumor pathology variable (benign or malignant) played an important role in the outcomes but was not considered? Your response isn't acceptable because this factor is very important and should be considered in each study.
6. 15. Indicators such as VAS score were used in most studies but were not reported in your study? Your response isn't useful for this study.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 15 Oct 2022

Dear authors,
Your article needs Major Revision.
Regards

5

Revision 4

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer 1:

Although some edition was done; but all previous comments wasn't considered and edited correctly. Therefore, these cases should be revised appropriately:

1. why didn't use a randomized clinical trial design, while the purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the treatment method?

Respond: thanks for your suggestion, our study is retrospective observational study and do not use a randomized clinical trial design and we revised effectiveness in paper with role .

2. The number of patients with bone metastasis that treated by CT-mediated microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty, in the method written 20 but in the title mentioned 47.

Respond: we have revised 47 in the title with 20.

3. This sentence "The main outcome aims to compare the effectiveness of CT-mediated microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty" is unclear and comparison group wasn't specified.

Respond: The main outcome aims to compare the rolerole of CT-mediated microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty in patients with bone metastasis in posttreatment than in pretreatment.

4. The scientific writing structure, and English edition of the manuscript isn't appropriate. The manuscript must be revised according to STROBE guideline, especially in the results section of abstract. Abstract results should be focused on questionnaire results. Moreover, where the any value compare between two times/groups; it should be presented value of each time along with p-value also in the parenthesis. We have corrected English edition by a experienced editor and revised according to STROBE guideline and presented the p-value.

5. Tumor pathology variable (benign or malignant) played an important role in the outcomes but was not considered? Your response isn't acceptable, because this factor is very important and should be considered in each study.

Respond: thanks for your comment, present study does not conduct tumor pathology.

6. 15. Indicators such as VAS score were used in most studies but were not reported in your study? Your response isn't useful for this study.

Respond: thanks for your comment, VAS score in further study will be conducted.

5 Revision 4

3 comments · 7 Jan 2023 – 16 Jan 2023

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 7 Jan 2023

Unfortunately, the authors of this manuscript have not paid appropriate attention to the previous comments. Therefore, the reviewing process can be long and tiring. At present, the manuscript needs major English language and grammatical editing. For example, in the objective of the abstract, the word role is repeated three times. The first and second sentences of the Methods section of the abstract can be merged. What does Pand mean in the Methods section of the abstract? The term disappear in the sentence “And follow-up material the all patients in this study has been collected and no patients during with period disappear.” should be replaced with lost to follow-up. Please carefully edit the manuscript for English usage and scientific writing structure.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 16 Jan 2023

Unfortunately, the authors of this manuscript haven’t paid appropriate attention to the previous comments. Therefore, the review process can be long and tiring. At present, it needs major English and grammatical editing. For example, in the objective section of the abstract, the word “role” is repeated three times. The first and second sentences of the method section of the abstract can be merged. What does Pand mean in the method section of the abstract? The term “disappear” in the sentence “And follow-up material the all patients in this study has been collected and no patients during with period disappear.” should be replaced with “lost to follow-up.” Please carefully edit the manuscript for English usage and scientific writing structure.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 16 Jan 2023

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

6

Revision 5

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

> Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Unfortunately the authors of this manuscript don’t have appropriate attention to the previous comments. Therefore, the reviewing process can be long and tiring. At present, it has needed major English and grammatical edition. For example, in the abstract objective, the word of role repeated three times. First and second sentences of abstract method can be merged. What is mean of Pand in the abstract method? The term of disappear in the sentence of “And follow-up material the all patients in this study has been collected and no patients during with period disappear.” Should be replaced with lost to follow-up. Please, carefully edit manuscript according to English edition and scientific writing structure.

> Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Unfortunately the authors of this manuscript don’t have appropriate attention to the previous comments. Therefore, the reviewing process can be long and tiring. At present, it has needed major English and grammatical edition. For example, in the abstract objective, the word of role repeated three times. First and second sentences of abstract method can be merged. What is mean of Pand in the abstract method? The term of disappear in the sentence of “And follow-up material the all patients in this study has been collected and no patients during with period disappear.” Should be replaced with lost to follow-up. Please, carefully edit manuscript according to English edition and scientific writing structure.

Response: The manuscript has been revised by a professional language editing service. Grammar errors have been corrected.

6 Revision 5

3 comments · 6 Feb 2023 – 3 Mar 2023

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 6 Feb 2023

Thanks to the authors for editing the English.
Currently, this manuscript is acceptable from a methodological perspective.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 16 Feb 2023

accept

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 3 Mar 2023

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

7

Revision 6

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Associate Editor 1:
accept
Associate Editor 2:
thank to authors for submitting the paper to IJR. the paper needs a heavy dose of english editing and scientific writing corrections.

1-the first title [Treatment effects of CT-mediated microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty in the therapy of bone metastases] is better than last title [Use of percutaneous microwave ablation for the treatment of bone tumors: A retrospective study of clinical outcomes in 20 patients]. The title should include metastasis and cementoplasty.
Respond: the title has been revised with Treatment effects of CT-mediated microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty in the therapy of bone metastases
2-what is the meaning of QLQ-BM22, QALY and EQ-5D? please add full term of abbreviations in first usage or write abbreviations with full terms for the first time together.
Respond: quality of life Questionnaire-Bone Metastases 22 (QLQ-BM22), quality-adjusted life years (QALYs), EuroQol Five Dimensions questionnaire (EQ-5D) have been added in first usage.
3-what is the menaing of this part: "….and no patients during with period were lost…."
Respond: no patients during with period disappeared.
4-in abstract conclusion, the quality of life seems better.
Respond: improve the life quality of patients with bone metastasis
5-in introduction: "…. extend to other sites of human body through a complex physiological process known as metastases. Metastases, which finally lead to….." please change both metastases to metastasis [singular form seems better than plural].
Respond: we have changed metastases to metastasis
6-therapeutic effect is better than therapy effect. In addition, therapeutic role is better than therapy role.
Respond: therapy effect is revised with therapeutic effect and therapy role is revised with therapeutic role.
7-what is "microwave magnetic"? microwave magnetic field?
Respond: microwave magnetic is revised with microwave magnetic field.
8-the following sentence is long and somehow unclear: "At present, microwave ablation technology, which can obtain irreversible coagulation and necrosis of the lesion tissue to achieve the purpose of reducing tumor cells by using microwave magnetic, can be used as an alternative technology to reduce surgical blood loss, cause revascularization, and not heat dissipation, low electrical conductivity, and thermal conductivity, providing a complete, unified, and predictable ablation effect." Please consider rephrase. In addition, "not heat dissipation" is unclear. Do you mean prevent heat dissipation? Please get English editor consult for whole manuscript.
Respond: we have revised with At present, microwave ablation technology, which can obtain irreversible coagulation and necrosis of the lesion tissue to achieve the purpose

of reducing tumor cells by using microwave magnetic field, can be used as an alternative technology to reduce surgical blood loss and cause revascularization, and microwave ablation technology has advantages of preventing heat dissipation, lowering electrical conductivity and thermal conductivity, then it provides a complete, unified, and predictable ablation effect.
9-what is the meaning of “our hospital oncology”? [our hospital oncology ward or clinic??]
Respond: our hospital oncology ward
10-what is the meaning of “Use Committee”?
Respond: hospital ethics committee
11-please correct: “The exclusion criteria for this study were”
Respond: it has revised with the exclusion criteria for this study were
12-this part is unclear: “Patients for before surgery shall be…..”
Respond: it is revised with “preoperative patients were”
13-please write the method section with past tenses. [presence and future sentences are not acceptable] [shall be, forbids, are, is,…….]
Respond: we have corrected with past tenses.
14-this part should be written appropriately: “Firstly, the patients are local anesthetized”
Respond: it is revised with ““Firstly, the patients were local anesthetized”
”
15- this part should be written appropriately: “according to cover the location of”
Respond: it is revised with “to covering the location for bone metastases”
16- this part should be written appropriately: “and until it is in the drawing stage, then the bone cement is slowly poured”
Respond: it is revised with “the bone cement was prepared and until it was in the drawing stage, then the bone cement was slowly poured into site of the bone metastasis treated by the ablation at low pressure”
17-there are two repetitive sentences: “After surgery, CT scan is immediately used to observe the position of bone cement and evaluate intraoperative complications.” And: “After the operation, CT scan was immediately used to observe the position of the bone cement to confirm that the cement is in the ideal position with no cement overflow or leakage for the surrounding tissues, blood vessels, spinal canal.” please integrate them in one single sentence.
Respond: we have integrated them in one single sentence
18-this part is unclear: “Patients with self-limiting, no sequelae, only a short period of hospitalization or minor treatment complications”
Respond: it is revised with “These symptoms in patient such as self-limiting, no sequelae, only a short period of hospitalization or minor treatment complications can be considered as minor complications”
19-please add sequential numbers to titles and sub-titles: 1-background, 2-objectives, 3-patients and methods, 3-1-patient enrollment, 3-2-procedure, 3-3- Safety evaluation, 3-4- Treatment efficacy evaluation, 3-5- Subsistence analysis, 3-6- Statistical analysis, 4-Results, 4-1- Intraoperative complications ……

Respond: we have added sequential numbers to titles and sub-titles
20-what is the meaning of “All dates from the patient” [dates??]
Respond: it is revised with “General clinical data from the patients was”
21-what is the meaning of “Full health status for the patient survival”?
Respond: it is revised with “Health survival status for the patient”
22-please add manufacturer data of SPSS based on IBM site.
[https://www.ibm.com/support/pages/how-cite-ibm-spss-statistics-or-earlier-versions-spss]
Respond: we have added manufacturer data of SPSS based on IBM site
23-this part is incomplete: “As is shown in Table1.” [the sentence has full stop at the end]
Respond: we have corrected full stop at the end.
24-in lines 3 and 4 of result, penetrated is wrong. Penetration seems better
Respond: penetrated is revised with Penetration.
25-please correct in result: “…. with bone metastases was cement leakage …..”
Respond: it is revised with “with bone metastases was cement leakage”
26-please write the complications in result by past sentences.
Respond: we have written the complications in result by past sentences
27-this sentence is hard to understand: “According to the evaluation standard of complication occurrence, 7 cases, who occupied an incidence rate of 18.9%, were recognized as minor complications.” [Totally 7 procedures (18.9%) showed minor complications based on standard evaluation methods???] [please note that complications are defined based on procedure; rather than patients. So, 7 cases is wrong; 7 out of 20 means 35%, not 18.9%]
Respond: we have revised 18.9% with 35%.
28-please get an intense English consult. The English writing and scientific writing style need major revision.
Respond: we have gotten an intense English consult.
29-in table 1, the data of Pathological type of primary bone tumors is wrong. [13 is nod defined for a specific primary tumor]
Respond: it is revised with a specific primary tumor.
30-in table 1, the data of Surgical site is incomplete [10+12+5+3=30; not 37]
Respond: it is revised with 30.
31- this part is incomplete: “ As is exhibited in Fig1.” [same as Q 23]
Respond: we have corrected full stop at the end.
32-it is better to be written as: pre-treatment and post-treatment.
Respond: it is revised with pre-treatment and post-treatment.
33-what is the meaning of Friedman P? P-value of Friedman test?
Respond: it is revised with P-value of Friedman test
34-in the sentence: “Friedman P between pretreatment and posttreatment (6 months posttreatment) is <0.05, and the difference is statistically significant (P<0.05).” The part P<0.05 is repetitive.
Respond: we have deleted “and the difference is statistically significant (P<0.05)”
35-this part is not a complete sentence and does not have verb: “To investigate the

median EQ-5D score from pretreatment to 6 months posttreatment for the patients treated by microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty."
Respond: we have revised with "To investigate the median EQ-5D score from pretreatment to 6 months posttreatment, the patients were treated by microwave ablation combined with cementoplasty."
36-this sentence is incomplete and does not have verb: "As shown in Fig 2, the median EQ-5D score for the patients increased from pretreatment to 1 week posttreatment."
Respond: we have revised with "As was shown in Fig 2, the median EQ-5D score for the patients was increased from pretreatment to 1 week posttreatment"
37-authors mentioned "The median EQ-5D had an increasing trend" while it increased from 0.38 to 0.56 and then decreased continuously to 0.44. what is the meaning of increasing trend?
Respond: we have revised with "Compared to the median EQ-5D in 1 week, the median EQ-5D had an increasing trend"
38-what is the meaning of "Finally, it is self-care ability and daily activity ability"?
Respond: it is revised with "There was improvement in self-care ability and daily activity ability"
39-this part is unclear and does not match with figure 3: "when using QLQ-BM22 score as the quality of life score, first take the percentage of QLQ-BM22 and then calculate the median QALYs score before operation 0.061, 1 month after operation 0.032, 3 months after operation 0.0653, and 6 months after operation 0.108 , P=0.0002,"
Respond: it is revised with "QLQ-BM22 score for pre-treatment, 1 month post-treatment, 3 month post-treatment, 6 month post-treatment were0.032, 0.461, 0.065, 0.108, respectively. Compared to 1 month QLQ-BM22 score for pre-treatment, QLQ-BM22 score for 6 month post-treatment was significantly increased ($P<0.05$)"
40-this sentence at the end of result section seems repetitive: "A healthy life for a year is counted as 1, death is counted as 0, and disability is counted as a number ……."
Respond: we have deleted this sentence.
41-what is the meaning of "psychosocial psychology"?
Respond: it is revised with "psychology"
42-what is the meaning of "improve the quality of the patients"?
Respond: it is revised with "improve the quality of life"
43-please add full term of abbreviations if first usage in abstract and in body of paper separately [QALYs, ….]
Respond: we have added first usage in abstract and in body of paper separately

7 Revision 6

1 comment · 30 Apr 2023

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 30 Apr 2023

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

8

Revision 7

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Associate Editor 1: The part related to Subsistence analysis is unclear and even wrong. The authors wrote: “Using QALYs to evaluate survival analysis, the median QALYs score is 0.039 pretreatment (n=20), posttreatment 1 month (n=20), 3 months (n=20), 6 months (n=16) were respectively 0.455, 0.102, 0.151 (Fig3); QLQ-BM22 score was used to evaluate the quality of life score, QLQ-BM22 score for pre-treatment, 1 month post-treatment, 3 month post-treatment, 6 month post-treatment were0.032, 0.461, 0.065, 0.108, respectively. Compared to 1 month QLQ-BM22 score for pre-treatment, QLQ-BM22 score for 6 month post-treatment was significantly increased (P<0.05), post-treatment was 0.032, 3 months post-treatment was, the difference is statistically significant (Fig3) These points could be noticed on this part:
Respond: thanks for your reviews, and we revised with “QALYs in this section was used to evaluate the survival analysis. Compared to QALYs score in pre-treatment, QALYs score for 1 month, 3 months, 6 months post-treatment was significantly increased (P<0.05), and the difference is statistically significant”
1: the authors used QALY while they wrote QLQ-BM22 score for …..? is this related to QALY or QLQ-BM22? Please clarify
respond: thanks for your reviews, we have deleted QLQ-BM22 score, this is related to QALY.
2: fig 3 is related to QALY while they wrote it as QLQ
respond: thanks for your reviews, we have revised QLQ with QALY.
3: if here they mean QALY, the 1 month value is higher than the others [pre treatment and 6 month] while they wrote , QLQ-BM22 score for 6 month post-treatment was significantly increased
respond: thanks for your reviews, we have revised QLQ-BM22 score with QALY score
4: this part is totally unclear: “Compared to 1 month QLQ-BM22 score for pre-treatment, QLQ-BM22 score for 6 month post-treatment was significantly increased (P<0.05), post-treatment was 0.032, 3 months post-treatment was, the difference is statistically significant (Fig3)” [all parts of sentence is unclear. For example; 3 months post-treatment was, was what?…..]
Respond: thanks for your reviews, we have revised it with “QALYs in this section was used to evaluate the survival analysis. Compared to QALYs score in pre-treatment, QALYs score for 1 month, 3 months, 6 months post-treatment was significantly increased (P<0.05), and the difference is statistically significant”

8 Revision 7

1 comment · 29 May 2023

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 29 May 2023

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards