

Dear Editor and Reviewers:

We feel grateful to the insightful comments made by the reviewers to improve our work. We would like to submit a revised manuscript (revisions highlighted) below is the point-by-point responses to each comment by the reviewers, where the reviewer comments were in blue and the additions to the text of the modified manuscript are in quotation marks.

Response to Reviewer

Reviewer #1:

Dear authors, I commend your work to contribute to the features of the GCT-ST in MRI which would elucidate the malignant lesion from the benign ones and aid in their differentiation and diagnosis using DWI and ADC values. I have a few minor corrections to be made to the manuscript before accepting the article for publication.

Comment 1: Expand the abbreviations when used for the first time in the manuscript
Eg Line No 54,55,56

Author: Thank you for your comment. We have Expand the abbreviations when used for the first time in the manuscript. Please see Page 2, Line 53-54.

Comment 2: Line No 112 The features listed are region specific and hence it would be better to be specific about the region of presentation before listing the features

Author: Thank you for raising this point. With regards to the findings of MR imaging or ultrasonography, superficial masses in the soft tissue can be further identified based on facial edema, skin thickening, skin contact, internal hemorrhage or necrosis and lobulation of the mass ^[12-15]. Please see Page 5, Line 112-114.

Comment 3: Rephrase Line 115-116

Author: Thank you for your suggestion. We have rephrased as “Unlike patients with deep-seated masses, size (i.e., 50 mm in diameter) is not an important factor in superficial soft-tissue lesions.” Please see Page 5, Line 115-116.