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Reviewer's report:

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.

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

*/ 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.

*/ 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.
**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.

Yes

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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