

Answers to Reviewers and Editor

We would like to thank the reviewer and the editor for thoughtfully reading our paper and are grateful for the comments as we think the raised issues substantially strengthen the paper. In the following we go through them point by point. The amendments in the manuscript are **highlighted in red**. Additionally, the manuscript was edited by a native English speaker from the biomedical field (see attached certificate). We hope that the answers and amendments are at your convenience and that the manuscript in the present form can be published in the “World Journal of Radiology”.

Sincerely yours, Ulf Jensen-Kondering (for the authors)

Reviewer #1:

The authors should also review the recent literature on the use of **QSM** from phase data and two references in that direction include:

We inserted a short discussion of QSM in the discussion part, SWI section and incorporated the references.

The authors should point out that whole brain SWI can be obtained at 3T in just 3 minutes with the conventional protocol making it quite viable for stroke studies. (See also the book on SWI published a year ago.)

We added the relevant information.

The authors also comment:

Although the data seems very encouraging and indirect validation has been done with very convincing results, validation with gold standard PET in the acute phase is still missing.

However, they might well make the statement:

Although the data seems very encouraging and indirect validation has been done with very convincing results, validation with gold standard PET or in the least with the use of complementary perfusion MRI in the acute phase is still missing.

Finally, the authors close with:

However, in the present state the method is unlikely to replace existing methods to visualize the ischemic penumbra.

which might better read

However, in the present state the combined use of perfusion and BOLD imaging would provide further complementary information to help visualize and understand the role of the ischemic penumbra.

We changed the text accordingly.

Figure 2 unfortunately is not the best example of asymmetrically prominent veins in stroke, as the authors note it is hard to tell in T2* sometimes and these images are a good example of that. Do the authors not have a good example with SWI?

We agree with the reviewer but unfortunately don't have a good SWI example as in our institution SWI unfortunately is not routinely used in acute stroke studies. We added a comment in the figure caption.

There is one weakness in this paper. The authors did not talk about the role of dilated veins. Could it be that venous blood volume increases leading to a larger T2* and BOLD effect but in fact there has been no change in overall flow or CMRO2? Further, using PWI may provide the means to show if in fact CBV increased or not. If not then one could conclude that the BOLD effect was in fact leading to a reduced oxygen saturation.

We inserted a paragraph in the discussion section discussing the role of dilated veins.

Editor:

The title should not include **Acronyms**. Please modify it. Thank you!

The acronym was replaced.

Is this the full name?

The names are now written in full.

Please provide the author contributions. See the format in the attachment file-revision policies.

The authors' contribution were added.

Please provide the professional title of the corresponding author.

The professional title of the corresponding author was added.

It should be '+' + 'Country Code' + 'NDD' + 'your phone number'. Please provide the telephone and fax number.

Telephone and fax number of the corresponding author was added.

An informative, structured abstracts of no more than 400 words should accompany each manuscript. Abstracts for original contributions should be structured into the following sections. AIM (no more than 20 words): Only the purpose should be included. Please write the aim as the form of "To investigate/study/...; It's too short. Please add it to 80 words. Thank you!

Authors should present exact *P* value where necessary and must provide relevant data to illustrate how it is obtained, e.g., 6.92 ± 3.86 vs 3.61 ± 1.67 , $P = 0.002$.

CONCLUSION(no more than 26 words).

The abstract was rewritten.

Please write this section here.

The section “Statistical analysis” was inserted.

Please revise this list like this one.

The references in table 1-3 were revised.

Please write “COMMENTS” section at here.

The “COMMENTS” section was inserted.