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Reviewer's report:

General Comment

This study shows that Gd-BOPTA has no interest for the characterization of hepatic hemangiomas compared with T2-weighted sequence. The result is important but the presentation is sometimes confusing and should be reviewed. Some of the data in the materials and methods section are part of the results. The distribution of groups with the number of patients is unclear. The discussion must be shortened. The English language shall be reviewed.

Abstract:

In conclusion add unenhanced MR imaging is the method of choice in discriminating.....

Introduction :

- I do not agree with the authors: A lot of papers in the literature have demonstrated that Contrast enhanced US examination allows characterisation of HH in most case.

- I do not understand why the authors say that it is necessary to introduce diagnostic procedure based on new organ specific contrast agent because they demonstrate the opposite in this paper

- Changes “radiographic characteristic” by “imaging characteristic” for MR imaging

- The purpose is not clear and could be rewritten: The purpose of this study is to evaluate whether the MR imaging characterisation of focal liver lesion can be improved using Gd-BOBTA and to compare with contrast-enhanced multiphase CT.

Materials and Methods

- What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria of this prospective study?
- What are the criteria for non specific hepatic mass observed in US?
- The presentation is confused with some of the data that should be in the section materials and methods. 161 patients and then 398 focal liver lesions with diagnosis for some of them and other non specific mass??
- What are the diagnosis criteria used for image analysis?

Results
- This sample of patients is unusual with very little patient with hemangioma hypointense on T2
- There is too much tables.

Discussion
- The discussion is too long and may be shortened

References:
No comments

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.