Dear Editor,

We’d like to express our sincere gratitude for your suggestion. It’s valuable for making this paper improve and better. After very careful revising and editing, we think this version is much better.

Reviewer #1:
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Minor revision
Specific Comments to Authors:
This manuscript evaluates the role of multi-modal imaging in diagnosing giant cell tumors in bone. The study involved 32 patients with giant cell tumors in their bones. The findings indicate that X-ray imaging provides comprehensive information about the tumor's location, while CT and MRI scans offer insights into the tumor's internal structure and its relationship with adjacent tissues. In summary, this paper demonstrates a reasonably good level of completeness and moderate novelty. I recommend a minor revision before considering it for publication. The author should include demographic information and clinical data related to the dataset used for the giant bone tumor study. In Figures 1 and 2, there is a discrepancy between the figure captions and the labels within the figures. For example, in Figure 1, the authors use labels 1A, 1B...1H, while the caption uses a, b...c. Please standardize these labels. Consider presenting a table to summarize all the results from the statistical analysis.

Reply:
Thank you very much for your appreciation and suggestion. We have added the demographic information and clinical data related to the dataset used for the giant bone tumor study in the background section. The figure captions and the labels within the figures were revised into the same, the capital letters. And we also built a table to summarize all the results from the statistical analysis. All the revised parts were highlighted with yellow color in the revised manuscript.

EDITORS OFFICE’S COMMENTS
Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office’s comments and suggestions, which are listed below:
(1) Science editor:
1 Conflict of interest statement: Academic Editor has no conflict of interest.
2 Manuscript’s theme: The topic is within the scope of the journal.
3 Scientific quality: The authors submitted a study of a multimodal imaging technique for diagnosing giant cell tumors of bone. The manuscript is overall qualified.
(1) Advantages and disadvantages: The reviewers have given positive peer-review reports for the manuscript. Classification: Grade C; Language Quality: Grade B. This manuscript evaluates the role of multi-modal imaging in diagnosing giant cell tumors
in bone. The study involved 32 patients with giant cell tumors in their bones. The findings indicate that X-ray imaging provides comprehensive information about the tumor's location, while CT and MRI scans offer insights into the tumor's internal structure and its relationship with adjacent tissues. In summary, this paper demonstrates a reasonably good level of completeness and moderate novelty. The author should include demographic information and clinical data related to the dataset used for the giant bone tumor study. In Figures 1 and 2, there is a discrepancy between the figure captions and the labels within the figures. For example, in Figure 1, the authors use labels 1A, 1B...1H, while the caption uses a, b...c. Please standardize these labels. Consider presenting a table to summarize all the results from the statistical analysis.

Reply:

Thank you very much for your appreciation and suggestion. We have added the demographic information and clinical data related to the dataset used for the giant bone tumor study in the background section. The figure captions and the labels within the figures were revised into the same, the capital letters. And we also built a table to summarize all the results from the statistical analysis. All the revised parts were highlighted with yellow color in the revised manuscript.

(2) Table(s) and figure(s): There are 2 Figures should be improved. Detailed suggestions for each are listed in the specific comments section.

Reply:

Thank you for the suggestion. The figure captions and the labels within the figures were revised into the same, the capital letters. All the revised parts were highlighted with yellow color in the revised manuscript.

(3) References: A total of 14 references are cited, including 4 published in the last 3 years. The reviewer didn't request the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself.

Reply:

OK.

4 Language evaluation: The English-language grammatical presentation needs to be improved to a certain extent. Before final acceptance, the authors must provide the English Language Certificate issued by a professional English language editing company. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240.

Reply:

Thank you very much for the suggestion. A professional English language editing service was employed for this paper. The revised paper was improved by highly qualified native English-speaking editors at AJE. The certificate was issued on February 8, 2024 and may be verified on the AJE website using the verification code A1E9-D505-1ECD-4357-F053.

5 Specific comments:

(1) Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. If the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is
copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the
copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check
and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s)
for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following
copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint
(PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2024.

Reply:
Provided in the revision.

(2) Uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar
contents; for example, "Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after

Reply:
Revised in the revision.

(3) Please add the author's contribution section. The format of this section will be as
follows: Author contributions: Wang CL, Liang L, Fu JF, Zou CC, Hong F and Wu
XM designed the research; Wang CL, Zou CC, Hong F and Wu XM performed the
research; Xue JZ and Lu JR contributed new reagents/analytic tools; Wang CL, Liang
L and Fu JF analyzed the data; Wang CL, Liang L and Fu JF wrote the paper.

Reply:
Author contributions: Kou MQ, Xu BQ and Liu HT designed the research; Kou
MQ, Xu BQ and Liu HT performed the research; Kou MQ and Xu BQ collected,
evaluated and analyzed the data; Liu HT reviewed all the medical record. Kou MQ
and Xu BQ drafted the initial manuscript, Liu HT reviewed the manuscript. All
authors read and approved the final manuscript.

(4) Please add the Core tip section. The number of words should be controlled
between 50-100 words.

Reply:
Added in the revision.

(5) Please provide the PMID and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all
authors of the references. If there is no PMID or DOI, please provide the website
address.

Reply:
Revised in the revision.

(6) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights”
section at the end of the main text (and directly before the References).

Reply:
Added in the revision.

(7) Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of
any approval document(s).

Reply:
Added in the revision.

(8) Please provide the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Review Board’s
official approval, prepared in the official language of the authors’ country.

Reply:
(9) Please provide the primary version (PDF) of the Informed Consent Form that has been signed by all subjects and investigators of the study, prepared in the official language of the authors' country.

Reply:

This is a retrospective study approved by the Medical Ethical Committee of Shaanxi Provincial People’s Hospital, the ICF was not the necessary document. The statement in the paper has been revised.

(10) Please provide the Biostatistics Review Certificate.

Reply:

Added in the revision.

(11) The manuscript type has been modified to a retrospective study.

Reply:

OK.

6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

When revising the manuscript, it is recommended that the author supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply PubMed, or a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA), of which data source is PubMed. RCA is a unique artificial intelligence system for citation index evaluation of medical science and life science literature. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: https://www.referencerecitationanalysis.com/.

Reply:

OK.

We also revised the format. After very careful revising and editing, we think this version is much better.

Thank you again! We value this chance very much. We are looking forward to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Huitong Liu