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Re: Morphometric Variability of Neuroimaging Features of Individuals with Agenesis of the Corpus Callosum

Dear Editors

We are pleased to hear of your interest in our manuscript and appreciate your thoughtful advice. As suggested by reviewers, we have made changes in the language and content to improve its suitability for publication:

Critiques from each reviewer were addressed as follows:

Reviewer 1:
   a) Major essential revision: the question addressed by this study is not clear
      a. We agree that the language regarding the aim of the study was ambiguous. We have changed the wording in the abstract to state that the aim of the study is to “characterize the morphological variations of the corpus callosum” rather than to “characterize the diverse presentations of the corpus callosum”.
      b. We removed all language regarding “validation of a classification system” as this statement is misleading.

   b) The conclusion of the article was changed to more accurately reflect the aims of the study.

   c) The background was expanded to include the clinical significance of the corpus callosum. We also explain the caveats of using a new refined classification system to characterize callosal variants.

   d) Methods:
      a. Discrepancy of inclusion dates was corrected.
      b. The procedures section was expanded to include details regarding the recruitment of patients in this study, imaging equipment used, and ethical issues

   e) Results:
      a. More information was included regarding the demographic information of the entire cohort. Of note, the title of the article was changed as the cohort includes adults and not only children.
      b. The final sentence of the results section was rephrased.

   f) Discussion
      a. Language of the discussion was rephrased to more accurately reflect the aims of the study.

Reviewer 2
   a) Abstract: 2\textsuperscript{nd} line, the work “but” was omitted
   b) Abstract: 3\textsuperscript{rd} line, the word “and” was omitted
   c) Methods: 3\textsuperscript{rd} paragraph; the word “intrahemispheric” was replaced by “interhemispheric”
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