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REQUESTED REVISIONS:

1. The authors should define what was the definition of treatment success in the study. Treatment success should include only response to clinical therapy and drainage. Surgery should be considered as treatment failure. New statistics should be performed based on that.

I agree with you, however, the surgical treatment in granulomatous mastitis is the last method to be considered, but it is still used as a treatment modality in cases that do not respond to medical treatment and are not suitable for drainage. For this reason, we added the treatment method in Table 3. In our case series, only 6 patients underwent surgical treatment which was partial mastectomy. There was no patient who underwent total mastectomy. We defined the cases in which we did not receive treatment response radiologically and clinically as the group with no success in treatment and we calculated our statistics on this basis.

2. When was the MRI performed, before any treatment or after initial treatment? /

MRI scan was performed before the treatment in all patients. The sentence “All of our patients underwent an MRI scan before treatment” was added into the material and method section. page 2 line 60.

3. The authors state that "the presence of radiologically and clinically complete resolution of the MRI findings was accepted as treatment success". Was MRI performed after treatment in all patients?

There were no MRI scan in all of our patients after treatment. However, radiological follow-ups with MRI, ultrasonography or mammography were available in all of our patients. Both clinical symptoms of the patients regressed and physical examination improved in patients whom treatment were successful. Cases with symptom relief and BI-RADS 1 and 2 on radiological follow-ups are accepted as radiological and clinical improvement, and those were accepted as successful treatment. The sentence "the presence of radiologically and clinically complete resolution of the MRI findings was accepted as treatment success" was rearranged as ‘The asymptomatic cases and BI-RADS 1 and 2 on radiological follow-ups were accepted as clinical and radiological improvement, and those were evaluated as successful treatment.’ Page 3, line 76.
4. It is not clear if the fistula formation was evaluated on MRI or if it was identified on clinical follow-up. / rearranged as 'The presence of a fistula clinically detected and also seen on MRI was recorded.'.

page 3, line 70

4. Was there any relation between the lesion location and presence of fistula? /

We did not evaluate the relationship between the presence of fistula and lesion localization. Since the lesions showed multifocal and multicentric distribution, we defined the lesion location as other quadrants and retroareolar region (table 2).

5. The authors cite in the discussion that "only one patient was managed with steroid therapy". Which was the medical treatment of the other patients?

Antibiotic and nonsteroidal antiinflammatory agents were administered to other patients as medical treatment. “Antibiotic and nonsteroidal antiinflammatory agents were the basis of our medical treatment.” was added to the material and method section. page 3 line 72

6. Were multifocality and multicentricity evaluated on MRI? Does it correlate with treatment response?

Multifocality and multicentricity were evaluated on basis of non-mass enhancements. There was no relationship between treatment success and these (table 2). “36 of the lesions were multifocal, 16 were multicentric and 6 were focal based on the findings of non-mass enhancement" was added to the results section (page 4, line 115).

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Language review is necessary.

Our paper re-edited by native English speakers and grammatical mistakes were corrected.

We did the revisions that you suggested. I believe my manuscript is more valuable for publication in the journal in the light of advices of you.