

Dec 15, 2015



Dear Ma,

Thank you very much for having our manuscript (23078) reviewed in a professional manner and for giving us an opportunity to revise the manuscript.

We also deeply appreciate the reviewers for their critical review of the manuscript with thoughtful and constructive comments. While the changes made in the revised manuscript are highlighted by colored (red) text, our point-by-point responses to the reviewers' comments are detailed below.

Thank you for your re-consideration of our manuscript and we are looking forward to your favorable decision. Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 23078 -revised manuscript.doc).

Title: Dual-input two-compartment pharmacokinetic model of DCE- MRI in hepatocellular carcinoma

Author: Jian-Feng Yang, Zhen-Hua Zhao, Yu Zhang, Li Zhao, Li-Ming Yang, Min-Ming Zhang, Bo-Yin Wang, Ting Wang, Bao-Chun Lu

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 23078

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Minming Zhang'.

Min-Ming Zhang, MD, PHD, Professor of Imaging and Nuclear Medicine

Department of radiology, Second Affiliated Hospital, College of Medicine, Zhejiang University

88 Jiefang Road, Hangzhou 310009, Zhejiang Province, China

Telephone: +86-571-87315255; Fax: +86-571-87315255

Email: zhangminming@zju.edu.cn

Reviewer:

Major Comment: Potential shortcomings (e.g., the rather small sample size) of the presented study are duly mentioned by the authors at the end of the "Discussion". On the whole, this manuscript would perhaps be more suitable for the World Journal of Radiology (rather than for the World Journal of Gastroenterology).

Minor Comments: Some typing errors should be corrected (e.g., page 10: "A p-value<0.05 was considered statistically significance." > "... statistically significant" ; page 12: "This modified evaluation criteria implies that..." > "These modified evaluation criteria imply that..." or "This modified evaluation criterion implies that..."; page 16: "becuase" > "because")

Response: We appreciate the thoughtful comments and suggestions of the reviewer for our paper and we are fortunate for meeting an earnest reviewer.

1. Potential shortcomings (e.g., the rather small sample size) of the presented study are duly mentioned by the authors at the end of the "Discussion".

Response: We agree with the opinion mentioned by reviewer that larger sample size will be better for verifying the study results. We used a paired-sample comparison to reduce impact of relative small sample size in this study.

2. On the whole, this manuscript would perhaps be more suitable for the World Journal of Radiology (rather than for the World Journal of Gastroenterology).

Response: Our research realm is relevant with both radiology and digestive system. Occasionally, we found some important reviews (such as "Perfusion magnetic resonance imaging of the liver". World J Gastroenterol 2010;16:1598-609. PMID: 20355238) about DCE-MRI applied in the liver were published in World Journal of Gastroenterology, when we reviewed relative references and we hoped our paper could be published in this journal for introducing our study results to some experts about this field. Frankly, WJG is covered by SCI with relative high IF and it is important to Chinese doctors. Of course, World Journal of Radiology also is one of important professional journal.

3. Some typing errors should be corrected (e.g., page 10: "A p-value<0.05 was considered statistically significance." > "... statistically significant" ; page 12: "This modified evaluation criteria implies that..." > "These modified evaluation criteria imply that..." or "This modified evaluation criterion implies that..."; page 16: "becuase" > "because").

Response: We thank reviewer for instructing us to revise the typing errors in detail and we have revised it. Please check it. We have revised "A p-value<0.05 was considered statistically significance." to "A p-value<0.05 was considered **statistically significant.**" (page 10); "This modified evaluation criteria implies that..." to "**These** modified evaluation criteria imply that..."(page 12); "becuase" to "**because**"(page 16).