Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Staging liver fibrosis with various diffusion-weighted MRI models” (NO: 89160). These comments are valuable and helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our research. We have considered the comments carefully and have made corrections which we hope will meet with approval. These changes will not influence the main content and framework of the paper. Substantially revised portions are marked in blue in the paper – other minor corrections of grammar and idiom are not marked. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as following:

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

The manuscript is interesting as regard studying non invasive methods for assessment of liver fibrosis but some comments to be considered:

1. methodology in the abstract liver biopsy as gold standard to be compared with different MRI models is not mentioned

Authors’ response: Thank the reviewer very much for the comments. We have supplemented the relevant notes in the Methods section of the abstract in Page 1.

2. reference of liver biopsy is not mentioned and why staging not done by metavir scoring or HAI(histology activating index.

Authors’ response: Thank the reviewer very much for the comments. We are very sorry for confusing the reviewer. For this part, we mainly referenced the consensus on the diagnosis and therapy of hepatic fibrosis in 2019. We have added this in page 6 “Biochemical tests and liver biopsies”.

3. The sample size is very small so statistical analysis is questionable –is there is relation of fibrosis and aetiology of liver fibrosis in MRI assessment the heterogeneity of the causes of liver fibrosis and very small number of each subgroups is limiting factor.

Authors’ response: We appreciate the reviewer’s advice. We have explained in the limitations that future studies with large sample sizes are still needed to further
confirm our results. Our team will continue to make efforts in this direction. And we hope to get your understanding.

4. discussion is very breife ,some references needs to be cited


Author’s response: We appreciate the reviewer’s helpful suggestion. We have read the literatures you recommended carefully. And they are indeed very helpful to my research. We quoted two of them in corresponding places in the Introduction and Discussion.

In conclusion, thanks very much for reviewer’s comments. They are of great help to my manuscript and future research. We have seriously revised some questions and hope to get your understanding and consent. Thank you for your attentions and wish you a pleasant life.