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Author’s response to reviews:

Farzad Khalvati, PhD
BMC Medical Imaging

Dear Editor and reviewers,

Re: BMIM-D-17-00058R1

Ultrahigh B-value diffusion-weighted imaging features of leiomyoma of the prostate-Case Report
Thank you very much for your nice and detailed review. We’ve provided a point-by-point revision or response to your comments. We deeply appreciate your valuable opinions, which stimulate a more thorough consideration of the essay.

Frederik De Keyzer (Reviewer 2): Minor Essential Revisions:

*/ The examples of grammatical mistakes I indicated in the previous round have mostly been corrected, but there still are quite a number of mistakes left in the text. Before acceptance, the text really should be read and corrected by an experienced English speaker. Just as an illustration, in the captions to Figure 1 you can find: "There is a capsule around the nodule as homogeneous low signal intensity…", "the lesions were slightly high signal nodule…", "pre scanned imaging, the signal…." and "tumor is enhanced obviously". These and many more need to be corrected.

Response: Thank you for your comments. We have revised the case report according to your suggestions. The revision has been thoroughly checked by an experienced research in terms of its fluency and readability. The paper has been again polished by the senior editor.

*/ Line 78: "A 15 ml of Gadobenate dimeglumine ..". I assume you mean a "15-ml bolus" or "dose"?

Response: Thank you for your comments. Changes have been made [Case presentation, L79].

*/ Lines 97 and 102: the ADC values would better be presented as 0.517 +/- 0.015 x10^(-3) mm^2/s and 0.710 +/- 0.049 x10^(-3) mm^2/s. That way they are in line with most DWI literature.

Response: Thank you for your comments. We have revised the sentences[Case presentation, Lines 90, 97, 102, 214, 308, 319].

*/ Line 143: I would not call the b-values chosen by Mussi et al "low". Maybe you could use "low and intermediate"? A b-value of 1000 is considered 'high' by all current DWI literature, and 800 is nearly there. It is also that using the term 'low' would lead people to think the perfusion effect would be substantially contributing to the ADC.

Response: Thank you for your comments. Yes, we have revised the the sentence as suggested [Discussion, L145].