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Reviewer's report:

General

The authors have responded to the majority of my comments made regarding the previous version of the manuscript. They have now added more details regarding the acquisition and interpretation of the MRA images. They have also provided details about the CTA exams. They explicitly state more of the limitations of the study. As revised, the manuscript describes the limited value of brain docking in a particular setting. The equipment used, as they acknowledge, is older and they attribute much of the study limitations to this older equipment. However, no comparisons are made to newer MR technologies to confirm this suggestion. Indeed few steps are taken to understand the true nature of the technology limitations. For example, no failure analyses are conducted (as I suggested in Major Compulsory Revisions # 2) to provide a better understanding of the false positive aneurysms. These factors decrease the overall interest of the study.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Additiona details and analysis regardint he interpretation of the MRA images are needed. Did the reader evaluate both the MIP images and the original source images? Considering the large fraction of false positives among the observed aneurysms, a failure analysis needs to be provided. After the findings were failed to be confirmed by CTA or DSA, the MRA images should be reexamined to determine whether the false positive findings could be explained?

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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

Statistical review: No
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