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**Reviewer’s report:**

The authors has revised their manuscript according to the reviewer’s suggestions.

I hope that the authors consider my comments, as mentioned below, to improve the paper.

**Abstract**

1, Background

“Gd-BOPTA” should be spelled out.

2, Background

“The purpose of this study is to evaluate whether diagnostic accuracy of hepatic hemangiomas in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) improves...” should be changed to “The purpose of this study is to evaluate whether diagnostic accuracy of hepatic Hemangiomas, showing atypical hyperechoic pattern on grey-scale US, in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) improves.”.

**Introduction**

3, The last paragraph, “The purpose of this study is to evaluate whether assessment of hepatic hemangiomas MRI improves with ....” should be changed to “The purpose of this study is to evaluate whether assessment of hepatic hemangiomas, with atypical appearance in US, MRI improves with ....”.

**Materials and Methods**

4, Page 4, the second paragraph. “The latter characterized by typical hyperechoic oval pattern with homogeneous or slightly inhomogeneous echotexture, well-defined margins and posterior wall shadowing.” This is a characteristic finding of hemangioma. The authors should also clarify the atypical US findings of hemangioma included in this study.

5, Page 6, the 4th paragraph. “Statistical analysis concerning evaluation of hemangiomas and malignant lesions in unenhanced, gadolinium-enhanced MR and CT studies”. The authors should clearly state what they compared statistically.

**Results**

6, Page 8, “Unenhanced MR and Gd-BOPTA-enhanced MR show higher
diagnostic efficacy in differentiation of hemangiomas than CT (p<0.000114,……..). What is “diagnostic efficacy”? Detection sensitivity? Diagnostic accuracy? As I said in the comment 5, The authors should clearly state what they compared statistically.

Discussion

7, Page 12, “Gd-BOPTA-enhanced MR in comparison with unenhanced MRI does not improve diagnostic efficacy in discriminating hemangiomas that show non-specific appearance in ultrasound examination.” The authors should clarify what is “diagnostic efficacy” and what is “non-specific appearance in ultrasound examination.”?

Figures

8, The authors should also show US images with atypical appearance of the three cases (case of Fig1,3,4, Fig 2, and Fig 5).
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