

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/abs-22-39>

Reviewer A

Page 5 ends at line 144 and page 6 begins at line 152 so all the relevant info added about Paget's disease seems to be in missing parts- pls correct

Thank you for pointing this out. We have updated the text so that the changes appear in red font rather than in tracked changes so the relevant information is readily visible on lines 151-154. Information regarding radiation recall is similarly updated in red font on lines 129-133.

Reviewer B

Thank you for resubmitting your review. I still have some comments and suggestions for improvements.

The introduction section still lacks a more thorough description of the rationale (and the objective) for this review in the context of what is already known. What is already known about the topic and why is it important to make a review about this?

We think this is an excellent suggestion and agree that this manuscript would be improved with a more thorough description of the rationale and objective. We updated the introduction section on lines 48-50 and 54-61.

In the abstract it is written in l. 39 that a comprehensive review is provided and in the introduction on p. 3, l. 59 an update on the current understanding is provided – is this the same, please be consistent.

We have clarified the abstract and introduction to state that the review is comprehensive on lines 36 and 57, since our manuscript is the first to comprehensively review the literature surrounding this topic.

A reference on the narrative checklist is missing on page 3 l. 63.

We have included this reference on pages 3 and 63 via a reserved DOI on Mendeley.

In the methods section (p. 3 l. 69) it is stated that: The titles abstract and full texts were reviewed by the authors. How was this procedure performed? Did you all do this independent and then discussed the selection or screening or how was the procedure? The method/procedure needs to be written in more detail and the supplemental table 1 could profitably be in the main text.

Thank you and we agree with the reviewer's assessment. We have updated the text to include a thorough description of the methods on lines 70-73. We have also updated the manuscript so that the previous supplemental table 1 is now in the main text as table 1.