

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS

June 28, 2015



Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 20199-Review.doc).

Title: Application of positron emission tomography/computed tomography in radiation treatment planning for head and neck cancers

Author: Musaddiq J Awan, Farzan Siddiqui, David Schwartz, Jiankui Yuan, Mitchell Machtay, Min Yao

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 20199

Thank you for your review regarding our paper entitled Application of PET/CT in Treatment Planning for Head and Neck Cancers. We have worked to format and address the important issues addressed in your response to our paper submission. This letter will seek to elucidate the changes made since our primary submission.

An effort was made to format the paper in terms of the uniform setting. The formatting of the author's names was corrected, a conflict of interest section was added, author contributions were stated and PubMed IDs were added to the references section. Additionally, a screenshot of the first page of one article by Wang et al. in the journal *PET Clinics* that did not have a PubMed ID is attached.

We are grateful to both reviewers for their kind contributions and suggestions to improve our work. Reviewer 1 had four total suggestions that I will address below.

Suggestion 1: To expand on the section on dental artifact to include other imaging artifacts.

Response: Given that the major metallic artifact that makes target delineation difficult in the head and neck is dental artifact, we felt that expansion to the utility of PET for other imaging artifacts would be beyond the scope of our article.

Suggestion 2: To add more information regarding the emerging technologies of 4D and TOF-PET.

Response: An additional paragraph was added to the Future Directions sections. I have copied it below for ease of access:

“Finally, improved acquisition technologies including time-of-flight PET (TOF-PET) and four-dimensional PET (4D-PET) are emerging. TOF-PET improves the signal-to-noise ratio in acquisition as well as reduces scanning time leading to improved image resolution.⁵² This may further improve the benefit of PET in target delineation of HNCs by reducing PET-GTVs. 4D-PET has primarily found clinical utility in lung cancers⁵³, an entity in which tumor motion is more prominent than in HNCs.

Though small relative to lung motion, organ motion does exist in the head and neck and an improvement in resolution and target delineation in HNCs by reducing artifacts may be expected with 4D-PET.”

Suggestion 3: To improve the qualities of figures especially Figure 6.

Response: We have attached new images to address Reviewer 1’s request for an improvement in image quality.

Suggestion 4: To define the term “EUA” in the abstract.

Response: Examination under anesthesia preceded the use of EUA in the abstract.

Reviewer 2 also provided excellent feedback regarding our work particularly in regards to grammar and structural changes. Here our responses to Reviewer 2’s five suggestions.

Suggestion 1: Improve the grammar and punctuation in the text especially in the introduction.

Response: We have improved the grammar and flow of the introduction by rearranging some sentences and adding punctuation in the introduction.

Suggestion 2: Remove the word IMRT from the keywords section and replace with imaging.

Response: We replaced IMRT with imaging in the keywords section.

Suggestion 3: When using abbreviations use the full term during the first usage.

Response: We worked to elucidate all abbreviations in the article as well as consistently use the same abbreviations throughout the article. For example, after first usage “head and neck cancer” was replaced by HNC throughout the article.

Suggestion 4: Divide the first major section of the article titled “Delineation of the Primary and Nodal GTV” into subsections to allow for ease of reading.

Response: We worked on dividing the first major section of the article into 4 subsections.

Suggestion 5: Rearrange the whole article structure in a clear and simplified way.

Response: We obliged his request by working to rearrange text in the article as a whole for ease of readability. A number of additional transitions were added and smoothened between points.

We are grateful for your continued interest in our submission for publication. We hope that the improvements we have made will lead to publication of this important review article in head and neck cancer radiation treatment planning.

Sincerely,

Musaddiq Awan, MD
Farzan Siddiqui, MD
David Schwartz, MD
Mitchell Machtay, MD
Min Yao, MD PhD