Minor Essential Revisions are needed for the following items. The author can be trusted to make these.

1. Some typos through the manuscript
2. Please define all MR imaging features using ACR BI-RADS MRI lexicon. This is the current standard to have the same communication language and to avoid confusion.
3. In a long study period of 7 years (1999 - 2006), please clarify that all studied subjects had exactly the same MR sequences and parameters.
4. Please specify how many frames for the DCE-MRI.
5. For the placement of ROI, please further explain how you did it when the tumor showed rim enhancement.
6. Please clarify the HER-2 staining. Was it by IHC or by FISH?
7. Since one of the major findings of this study was the correlation of the kinetic enhancement and the MVD, details of how these two parameters were measured and compared in the exact tumor location are needed, especially for a tumor showing heterogeneous enhancement.
8. In your results, "we found that tumors showing a maximum enhancement peak at two minutes or longer, had a significant higher MVD count than those ones that reached this maximum point before two minutes (p=0.012)”, although you have some explanation in the Discussion section, more detailed explanation of how your results were different from previous studies are needed.
9. Again, your results -- "The percentage of tumors with vascular invasion or with high mitotic index was significantly superior among those showing a low percentage of maximum enhancement (#150%) before two minutes than in those showing a high percentage (>150%) of enhancement rate at that time interval (p=0.016 and p=0.03, respectively”", need to have some discussion why you have the findings.
10. The description - "These findings seem to indicate that MRI could provide prognostic information independent of those classical factors" is too strong and without data support in your study. Please modify.
11. Please add a paragraph of study limitations in the end of the Discussion
section.

12. The conclusion should be expanded regarding the major findings of this study, how they are adherent, or against, to the existing literature, and what are the potential results which may be helpful for patient management.
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