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Reviewer’s report:

To the authors

The authors have addressed the changes requested by reviewers for the most part. Only a few more things should be clarified.

1. The data from the Figure in their response to the reviewers relating flow in the IJ (based on ultrasound) with the degree of stenosis as measured on MR is interesting data and should be included in the paper, even though no data is available for the controls.

2. p 9. Methods. The last sentence of first paragraph (discussing the intra-class correlation between readers) should be moved to the Results section.

3. p 9. Methods. It is not clear to me why the authors chose p<0.025 to correct for multiple comparisons. A typical method for doing this is to use the Buonferroni correction, which is the original p value divided by the number of comparisons. I see at least 4 comparisons in the text of the methods section, so p<0.05/4 = (p<0.0125). Based on these metrics, only the last 2 comparisons on p 10 are significant, the rest are trends (though quite strong trends). This suggests that the cutoff of >=2 for stenosis is the most meaningful.

4. p 10. Results. I am a little confused reconciling the data presented in the text and that in Table 1. To me, it looks like 13 TMB patients had severe narrowing (grade=3) compared with 2 controls based on the Table, not 10 and 2 reported in the text. Perhaps this is because of patients who had multiple stenoses in the TMB group. If so, the authors need to clarify this.

5. p 13. Discussion. 5th line. Because there are many quantitative MR methods, the authors need to include the word “flow” in the sentence: “promising quantitative <flow> measurements…”

6. p 13. Discussion, 2nd paragraph. The highlighted sentence beginning “We did found...” has multiple English grammar errors and needs to be proofed before publication. I have no idea what it means that “comparisons and further judgments can be drown”, for example.

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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