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Reviewer's report:

This is a revised manuscript of BMIM-D-16-00216R1 after reject. The authors reported a case of prostatic leiomyoma with MR findings, including DWI analysis. However, for clinical aspect, it is easy to distinguish prostatic leiomyoma from prostate cancer on MR imaging.

This is an incidental report to depict a leiomyoma on MRI in the prostate after the radical prostatectomy. Frank S. Patch and Lawrence J. Rhea reported "LEIOMYOMA OF THE PROSTATE GLAND" in 1935, British Journal of Urology Volume 7, Issue 3, pages 213-228, September 1935. According to their literature review, 25.4% of 181 consecutive patients, who had total prostectomy, coexisted leiomyoma in benign hyperplastic (BPH) nodules.

Overall, this manuscript was well-revised and the image quality became much better. However, for the above reasons, this case would not be rare.

The authors should cite Patch and Rhea's paper and can point out that most cases of co-existence with leiomyoma and BPH would be missed on MRI.

Major issues:

p8L144, this line should be reconsidered for the above reasons.

p9L167-168, remove this sentence.

In the background, after L53-54 sentence, the author can describe why they performed a radical prostatectomy clearly. The reason would be to remove prostate cancer. Incidentally, the leiomyoma was found in BPH nodule after the operation.
Minor issues:

In abstract, (T2W1) > (T2WI), (T1W1) > (T1WI)

> These abbreviations are not necessary in the abstract since no repeated use of these terms were not seen.

Table 1, unify the font style.

---

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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