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Submission:
Revision of “Diagnostic value of retrospective PET-MRI Fusion in Head-and-Neck Cancer”

Dear Professor Solera,
dear associate Editors,

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We greatly appreciate all your notes and comments with regard to our paper. Your suggestions are gratefully welcomed and have found consideration in our article.

Enclosed you will find a detailed point-by-point letter with respect to the reviewers comments. Any changes that we have made to the originally submitted manuscript are highlighted by using the track changes mode in MS Word.

Please also find enclosed our revised manuscript for consideration as an original article for the Journal of BMC Cancer.

Reviewer: Jinha Park

1. We performed language editing.
Reviewer: Bryan Yoo

1. The study was not IRB approved because all diagnostic imaging were clinically indicated and retrospectively analyzed. We included this information in the methods section.

2. We replaced “woman” with “women” in paragraph 1 of the patient population section.

3. We described the basis for the initial manual and the software-based alignment in more detail in the method section.

4. In the last part of the discussion we added a more detailed discussion regarding the limitations of the study in the manuscript.

5. In the method section we described the role of the two observers in the study.

6. The SUV measurement was described as a supportive tool in the method section but data was not mentioned. The evaluation of PET/CT and the fused images according to the diagnostic accuracy was based on visual criteria, compare score scale in the method section. The visual analyses of all PET/CT images were scaled according to a SUV of five. This information is listed in the method section of the manuscript. The lesion SUVs did not add any substantial information in our study, therefore we did not include them. In the new version of the manuscript we have deleted the respective content from the method section.

We hope that we have suitably attended to the reviewers' comments. We look forward to hearing from you after the reviewing process and will be delighted if the manuscript is accepted for publication in your journal.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

Priv.-Doz. Dr. Dr. Denys J. Loeffelbein