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Author’s response to reviews:

August 14, 2019

Dear reviewers and editor-in-chief of BMC Medical Imaging:

Please find attached a revised version of our document “The use of non-contrast-enhanced MRI to evaluate serial changes in endoleaks after aortic stenting: a case report”. (BMIM-D-19-00178R1).

Thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript. We have studied reviewer’s comments carefully and tried our best to revise our manuscript according to the comments. Revisions in the text are shown in the new uploaded manuscript. We sincerely hope that our revisions to the document combined with our accompanying responses will be sufficient to render our manuscript suitable for publication in BMC Medical Imaging.
We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Yu-Li Lee
No.6, Sec. W., Jiapu Rd., Puzi City, Chiayi County 613, Taiwan (R.O.C.)
E-mail: a0929103629@gmail.com

Corresponding author:
Chien-Wei Chen, MD
Department of Diagnostic Radiology, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital Chiayi Branch, Chang Gung University College of Medicine, Institute of Medicine, Chung Shan Medical University, Taiwan
Address : No.6, Sec. W., Jiapu Rd., Puzi City, Chiayi County, Taiwan
E-mail : chienwei33@gmail.com

Title of the Manuscript:
The use of non-contrast-enhanced MRI to evaluate serial changes in endoleaks after aortic stenting: a case report
Manuscript Number: (BMIM-D-19-00178R1)

Those comments of the reviewers were highly insightful for revising and enabled us to improve the quality of our case report. We have studied comments carefully and made correction which we hope meet with approval. In the following pages are our responses to each comment from the reviewers as well as your own comments.

Comment 1
Consider adding a sequence describing the essential features of 4D PC MRI (i.e. single scan allowing for both lumen anatomy and flow information in the entire aortic volume over time with flow velocity encoded in 3 directions)
Author’s response

Thank you for providing these insights. I have added the supplement in the section of discussion, the line 85.

Comment 2

Line 23: consider rewording/expansion of the initial treatment procedure description

Author’s response

Thank you for your important reminder, and I have expanded the treatment procedure and details in the section of case presentation, from the line 31.

Comment 3

Line 44: „…..was thus inappropriate, as the contrast is nephrotoxic". The phrase as the contrast is nephrotoxic should be removed or replaced as it is imprecise in this context- it implies that also gadolinium contrast is directly nephrotoxic

Author’s response

Thank you for reminding me the incorrect phrases in the manuscript, and I have revised the sentences in the text to avoid using the term of direct nephrotoxicity for gadolinium contrast of MRI.

Comment 4

Line 53: was the coil embolization of the aneurysmal sac effective? Are follow-up images available?

Author’s response

Thank you for raising this important issue. We also tried to find out the allowability of 4D-PC MRI for detecting the treatment efficacy after coil embolization. However, due to the old age and many comorbidities of the patient, he underwent against advise discharge after progressed respiratory failure during the same hospitalization in August 2018, so the follow up images could not be obtained from the patient.

Comment 5

Line 56: the sentence „However, possible nephrogenic fibrosis must be considered when weighing contrast-enhanced CTA or MRA for patients with CKD(10)” requires correction for
the same reasons as pointed out for line 44 above, e.g. it is MR (and not CT) contrast media use that is related to NSF cases.

Author’s response

Thank you for your considerate reminder. I have revised the text in the manuscript in the section of the discussion, from the line 75.

Comment 6

Reference to Figure 4 seems to be missing from the text- to be added.

Author’s response

Thank you for your reminder. I have revised the figure legend in the end of the manuscript, and the reference to the Figure 4 was in the text of the line 82.