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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor Comments:

Comment 1:
The Authors improved the quality of the manuscript, as properly remarked by the reviewer # 1. However, I agree with the reviewer 2 on the need to rearrange the final part of the "Study design" paragraph in a more conventional way. Please, follow the other indications. Though minor in nature, they might help to further improve the manuscript.

Response 1:
We have revised the manuscript accordingly.

Reviewer 2:

Comment 1:
I am sorry but I disagree with your answer, regarding the placement of the paragraph "study objectives" in the section "Study design". Materials and methods should only contain description of participants/patients, imaging methods/procedures and statistical analysis. So, objectives can be kept and described at the end of the introduction section. But, at this point, this is an "editorial" issue. Please
check with the Editor.

Response 1:
We have revised the manuscript accordingly.

Comment 2:
The description of the "standard of reference" at the end of the paragraph "Study design" (lines 22-25) is also redundant and can be moved/kept in the section "Image analysis".

Response 2:
We have revised the manuscript accordingly.

Comment 3:
Discussion
Line 13-14: "despite shorter acquisition". I would choose another adverb instead for "despite", since the shortening the examination might be an advantage in some cases. I would advise to revise the English grammar and the structure of the sentences with a native speaker.

Response 3:
We have deleted the last part of the sentence starting with “despite”.

Comment 4:
Limitations
Line 51: add "pancreatic" to biliary (nowadays, there are many therapeutic endoscopic procedures performed even on the pancreatic duct). Line 19-20: "the results showed be confirmed in …". Probably "slip of the pen". Change to "should".

Response 4:
We have revised the manuscript accordingly.

Comment 5:
Conclusion
revise the structure of the sentences with a native speaker. Lines 30-35: controversial statement. PD is often an incidental finding. So, since the reasons for MRI were several in this study (extrapancreatic tumors, extrapancreatic non-oncological disease, intrapancreatic tumors, etc.), and the time saving would be "176 sec" (= 2-3 minutes), how would an MRI without 3D-MRCP improve cost-effectiveness?

Response 5:
The paragraph has been revised.