

Response to the Reviewers' comments

Thank you very much for the kind words of appreciation of our paper. Concerning the comments:

Reviewer 1

Manuscript by Dr. Haitham Salameen on « The Value and Limitations of Contrast Enhanced Ultrasound in Classifying Focal Liver Lesion When Other Imaging Techniques Were Inconclusive: A case report. » Comment by Prof. em. dr. Eddie Wisse I have read the paper by dr. Salameen as a basic hepatology-scientist (cell biology, histology, electron microscopy). This paper is well written, in good understandable language and has a logic structure. The paper compares the results and images obtained of a liver lesion with three different clinical visualization techniques. I have no expertise allowing me to judge the clinical procedure or the conclusions, but I have few remarks which might further improve this valuable presentation.

1.The manuscript would benefit from adding a list of the many abbreviations used in the text. This would help the interested, non-radiologists to have a more comfortable reading.

Response: -As for terminology we have tried to add the full name of an abbreviation at least once throughout the article, we have also added a list of all abbreviations used in the manuscript

2.A little more information about the microbubble preparation regarding its composition and behavior after injection would be welcome

Response: -We have added a clearer and much more detailed information about microbubbles' composition and interactions

3.The images are small, and so is the lesion depicted. It would help the reader to have the images a bit larger.

Response: -We have included the full-size images as per request of the editorial office, hopefully they will be clearer

4.Depending on the clinical importance and meaning of the originally observed lesion, I wonder whether it would have been helpful to have taken a needle biopsy of the observed spot to be judged as a "golden standard" in the diagnosis by a pathologist. Luckily, the lesion disappeared, leaving the question about its nature unanswered. The value of the manuscript seems to be with the comparison of the three different visualization methods. On one hand it seems to be a pity that the nature of the lesion could not be determined.

Response: -You are absolutely right, and this is the point we are trying to make throughout the article "more comprehensive diagnosis is always require", along with the fact that the lesion spontaneously disappeared , however a biopsy is not necessarily the "Gold Standard" when treating patients, you are right in that it might be a pathologists "gold standard" but clinically it is an invasive procedure, that does pose risks to the patient such as bleeding and so on, we would also like to state that we asked the patient to have the biopsy, but the patient refused. Hopefully in this reviewed article it would be much clearer. If it still isn't the case however, we welcome your feedback as to how can we these points clearer

Reviewer 2

1.Salameen et al. reported a case of small Focal Liver Lesion. The case report has many limitations. Patient's demographics, laboratory examination results are absent.

Response: -We have included the patient's results and details in case report.

2.Generrally diagnosis of this small lesions depends on the experience of radiologist. The case report does not contribute to the current medical literature. Thank you for giving opportunity to review this report

Response: - The point that we were trying to make was that CEUS although a great asset to surgeons it is yet not foolproof and doctors should have to perform a more comprehensive investigation, and to highlight the fact in cases such as ours doctors should not just rely on one diagnostic medium to attain a final proper diagnosis. We were lucky that the lesion appeared to be benign, as a final diagnosis of the FLL is very vital to the patient's outcome, and we should be weary of technologies pitfalls and not trust them blindly, a more comprehensive investigation should have followed. We would also like to point out the disappearance of the lesion. Hopefully this revised manuscript shows this point.

Reviewer 3

The manuscript by Salameen et al. is on the value and role of Contrast Enhanced Ultrasound (CEUS) on focal liver lesions (FLLs) in comparison with CT scan and MRI. The Authors reported a clinical case in which on a focal liver lesion CT and MRI lead to contradictory conclusions whereas CEUS was able to diagnose it as a benign lesion. CEUS is very useful to distinguish benign from malignant lesions, recommended for characterization of FLLs especially in non-cirrhotic livers and is an optimal option when MRI and CT cannot be performed

1. The case report is not original and does not add anything to the current knowledge.

Response: -This case reports originality does not stem from only the point that we made that CEUS although a great asset to it is yet not foolproof and the fact in cases such as ours a more comprehensive investigation should have been ordered to attain a final proper diagnosis.This fact this should be seen more of a reminder to clinicians. The spotlight of the article should be that the lesion **spontaneously disappeared** in follow up and could not be detected using CT ,CDU or any another noninvasive means.

2.Minor comments. It requires minor language revision.

Response: -We have revised the language.