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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Sir/ Madam,

Thank you very much for passing on these comments from our reviewers, which we believe are very helpful in improving the overall quality of the manuscript. We thank the reviewers for their time and comments. We have incorporated their excellent and valued suggestions into the manuscript, and re-submit for further consideration.

To address the specific points raised by reviewer 1:

1. The abstract adequately outlines the purpose of the paper and is sufficiently succinct. I suggest adding “shotgun” to the list of keywords.

   Thank you for the prudent suggestion, which we have now added.

2. The findings section appears to me as more of an “introduction” section and could perhaps be so labeled. Also “it’s” should be “its”.

   We agree and had initially labeled the section ‘introduction’ but as this did not conform to the journals requirements for short reports were earlier asked to change this to ‘findings’, which we have done. The spelling of the word ‘its’ has been amended, with thanks.

3. Case descriptions follow. Regarding case 1 there is redundancy between the case discussion and figure descriptions, and in some figures there is a minor difference between the text and figure descriptions and in most there is no additional information. I suggest consolidating the figure descriptions into the body of the text and abbreviating the descriptions themselves or vice-versa.

   Excellent suggestion – thank you for this. We have consolidated and trimmed the excess overlap between the figure descriptions and text.

4. Figures themselves just require relabeling (from figure 1,2,3 etc to figure 1a,b etc) to correlate with the figure descriptions and optimized layout.

   Done.

5. The first paragraph of the discussion section is well written and informative and seems well referenced.
   a. The discussion of case 1 hinges on the comparison of CT scans documenting firstly reduced flow and subsequently increased flow in the MCA territory despite and unchanged pellet location. This discussion would be better served if a figure were provided that demonstrated the described finding of reduced flow (there is a non contrast scan of the infarct but the reduced flow on CTA does not have a corresponding image). I suggest that if such an image is available it be added to increase reader interest in the case 1
discussion section. If it is unavailable then this section of the discussion could be abbreviated. There is also a paucity of references for the postulated mechanism of this phenomenon. References appear satisfactory and well formatted otherwise.

*We have abbreviataed the discussion as requested.*

Comments from Reviewer 2:

Authors of the article describe two interesting cases of shotgun pellets embolization. Their letter includes nice figures.

Abstract:
Abstract should be more informative and could contain some details of both cases. The second clause in the abstract is more a conclusion of the whole abstract.

*We have included extra information to detail the cases further in the abstract.*

Case 2:
In the text authors refer, a retrograde embolization into the left iliolumbar vein; however, in the legend to the figure 2b we see: ...right iliolumbar vein.

*Thank you we have corrected this.*

Discussion:
Please correct Da costa to Da Costa. Authors should also highlight in the text their new contribution or observations to the topic.

*We have corrected this and endeavoured to highlight this wherever possible.*

References:
There are some format issues, please follow instructions for authors and apply them to the letter.

*Thank you - we have revised the references in strict accordance with the published guidelines of the journal*