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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thanks a lot for your mail and comments. We have revised the manuscript according and hope the revised paper is acceptable. Attached below is a point to point response to the comments. Let me know if you have any concerns and questions and looking forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,

Wei Deng

Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Hainan General Hospital,
Point to point response

Editor Comments:

While overall improved, the manuscript still needs some work.

- Abstract, lines 24-26. Please correct, since “were analyzed” and “was used” are redundant.

Response: corrected, thanks.

- Abstract, line 33. Please, correct “patents”.

Response: corrected, thanks.

- Abstract, lines 43-48. Those added statements are confusing, and can be removed from the abstract.

Response: revised, thanks.

- Abstract, line 50. “Reliable” and “accurate” sound redundant.

Response: revised, thanks.

- Background, page 7, line 36. “Gold standard” is not the recommended term. Please, use “standard of reference”.

Response: revised, thanks.
- Background, page 8, lines 26-39. Honestly, the role for SWE in the MSK system is out of context here, and should be eliminated. The same for the role in liver tumors at lines 46-50 and page 9, lines 7-9. The reviewer # 2 and I asked for better defining the role of SWE in CLD, so that referring to other clinical scenarios sounds irrelevant.

Response: revised, thanks.

- Page 10, line 42. What “corroborated” stands for?

Response: revised, thanks.

- Page 12, line 35. Please, correct “virial”.

Response: corrected, thanks.


Response: revised, thanks.

- Page 18, lines 42-45. Those limitations are still unsounding. What “small sample size” means? Limited number of studies you were able to include? What “operator variation” means? The fact you did not account for the operators’ experience in analysis?

Response: revised, thanks.