



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com <http://www.wjgnet.com>

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 20370

Manuscript Type: MINIREVIEWS

Dear Editor:

Thanks for you and your reviewers for patience, effort and time paid to my manuscript. Here is the author's reply to the respectable reviewers: Reviewer:

1.

Q: The normal conversion of marrow should be described in more details.

A: This was described in more details.

Q: The uptake of USPIO by marrow should be provided in more details.

A: A more detailed discussion of their mechanism of action was added.

Q:

Figure (1) has low image quality, should be replaced with good SNR image.

A: Unfortunately; this is an old case from photographed soft-copy by a digital camera and not saved from a work station. However; the point inferred from image is that richness of the spines by red marrow results in signal similar to the adjacent vertebral muscles is clear.

Reviewer-2:

Q:

1)

Congratulations for your good work. It speaks of an excellent understanding

of the subject. However, I believe with some extra effort this can be made even better

polishing the English language.

The whole manuscript has been linguistically revised, as suggested.

Q2) provide illustrations for all the conditions that you have described in words (currently just around half of them are illustrated)

A:

3) demonstrate through images and legend how you would distinguish a pathology/ variant response from its closest mimic

This is a good suggestion and figure legends were revised for more declaration. A new figure was added (figure-10). I tried to keep in adherence to the main purpose of the current review about normal spinal marrow. Your suggestion motivates me to submit another part to declare this soon.

Reviewer-3:

Q: No new information from the Article.

as similar Article in AJR by Shah et al. published in 2011.

Indeed; it was a good article but there is a merit in our current work that simplified the physiologic aspects of bone marrow and variant that was somewhat reduced in their work. Besides, the idea of the article came from misunderstandings of my junior colleagues I meet every day so I decided to try simplifying these data.

Reviewer-4:

The authors reviewed the MR imaging of the spinal marrow focusing on the basic understanding of the normal marrow pattern and its variants. A good review. However, some problems existed.

Specific comments:

Q:The language needs a major improvement because of a lot of grammar mistakes and misuse of punctuations. Please have a native English speaker revise the language for you.

A: This has been performed as recommended and stated earlier.

Q2. Abstract: There is no abstract found in this MS. Please write a non-structural abstract without the structures of Purpose, Materials and methods, Results and Conclusion. In this abstract, please state the background of the review and some main findings.

A: A brief non-structured abstract was added.

Much Obligated for Your time and efforts,

The Author.