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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewers:

We are deeply grateful to the insightful comments and suggestions made by the reviewers on our manuscript. We have made revisions accordingly by taking account of each and every comment and suggestion by all reviewers. After revising as suggested, we believe that the manuscript have been improved significantly. Detailed point-by-point responses to each comment by the reviewers (in blue font) are provided below.
Response to editor

Comment 1: pg 1 line 13: delete "of"

Author: We changed as recommended in the revised manuscript and please see Abstract Methods section, Line 13, Pg1

Comment 2: pg 4 - lines 68-81: Did all 4 patients also have both Mammogram and Ultrasound prior to MRI? If authors cannot explain why these lesions were not seen on mammogram or ultrasound, then end the sentence after "all patients had a unilateral lesion" and delete lines 69-71

Author: We changed as recommended in the revised manuscript and please see Methods section, Line 68 “All patients had a unilateral lesion.”, Pg4

Comment 3: pg 6 line 113 change "recurrences" to "recurrence"

Author: We changed as recommended in the revised manuscript and please see Results section, Line 110, Pg6

Comment 4: pg 7 line 121 change "lesions of internal enhancements were" to "internal enhancement was"

Author: We changed as recommended in the revised manuscript and please see Results section, Line 118, Pg6

Comment 5: pg 7 line 138 change "enhancements were" to "enhancement was"

Author: changed as suggested. Please see Discussion section, Line135, Pg7

Comment 6: pg 8 lines 144 - 155. As written, this paragraph remains confusing to the reader and again requires rewriting prior to considering acceptance of this manuscript. what are typical adc values of malignant lesions? benign lesions?

Author: The paragraph was completely revised. Please see Discussion section, Line 141-151, Pg8.
Comment 7: pg 8 line 150 & 151: change "fibrous adenomas" to "fibroadenoma"

Author: Deleted it.

Comment 8: pg 9 lines 158-160: As written, sentence is confusing to the reader: ..."compared to benign or normal breast tissues presenting a Cho metabolite peak". do benign or normal breast tissues have a cho metabolite peak?

Author: The paragraph was completely revised. Please see Discussion section, Line 152-166, Pg8-9.