

April 27, 2020

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 55551-Manuscript File.docx).

Title: Role for contrast-enhanced ultrasound in assessing complications after kidney transplant

Authors: Giuseppe Como, Jacopo Da Re, Gian Luigi Adani, Chiara Zuiani, Rossano Girometti

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 55551

We thank the editors and reviewers for their thoughtful comments and observations. The revised manuscript incorporated suggestions of the scientific editor and reviewers, as follows:

1. Reviewer # (103656577):

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

- This a good review manuscript to introduce the CEUS in evaluating complications of KT patients. The diagnosis of post-KT complications is really important, in this MS, authors summarized the advantages and disadvantages of CEUS in dealing with KT complications, which provided many helps to surgeons to treat with patients.

We really thank the reviewer for the positive comments, and hope the paper has improved after the revision.

2. Reviewer # (204481741):

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

- The English expression and the Figures are good.

Thank you for the positive comment. The original manuscript has been edited by a professional agency (MD Medical Writing). We made minor changes in the revised version according to the reviewer's suggestions. We hope that English language is suitable for publication.

- Major weakness: the text is too tedious, which need to be shortened and refined. ie sections of CEUS technique and examination technique could be omitted, and sections of advantage and disadvantages of CEUS and post-transplant anatomy should be refined.

Concerning the "CEUS technique" section, we only partially agree with the reviewer. One might argue that not all the readers are experienced CEUS operators, and that less skilled readers would probably expect to find as more information as possible in a review, especially if further literature resources are not easily available/accessible. On the other hand, we acknowledge that the text can be shortened. We then

eliminated several redundant statements and merged previously separated paragraphs into a single one.

Concerning the “advantages and disadvantages” paragraphs, please see the reply below.

Concerning the paragraph on post-surgical anatomy, we refined several unsounding/unclear sentences, as properly suggested by the reviewer. We also cut a redundant sentence on renal vein elongation, and added a drawing in Fig. 1 (currently labeled as Fig. 1c) illustrating the arterial reconstruction technique using the aortic patch.

- Major weakness: the advantage and disadvantage parts are not well addressed. Advantage and disadvantage of CEUS in the diagnosis of KT complications should be added.

We are not sure we understood the reviewer’s comment, since advantages and disadvantages we described relate to the KT scenario, though some of them are unavoidably generalizable to other post-surgical scenarios. We then changed the section title from “Advantages and disadvantages of CEUS” into “Advantages and disadvantages of CEUS in the KT scenario”, and believe that, having in mind the average reader rather than the experienced one as the review target, this approach can better elucidate the role of CEUS in the postoperative period.

In our opinion, adding additional statements on each complication would be redundant as compared to what reported in the “Clinical applications” section, thus carrying the risk of making the text longer and tedious to read.

- Major weakness: most of references the author cited were published in the past decade, more and more references published recently could be used in this review.

In the originally submitted manuscript, 29/72 (40%) references were published between 2015 and 2020, and 47/72 references (65%) were published between 2010 and 2020. We now removed/modified 8/25 (32%) pre-2010 references, and 8/43 (19%) pre-2015 references, based on a new search on PubMed, Scopus and WOS. We also added 2 references published in 2019, and 1 reference published in 2017.

We believe that the remaining pre-2010 and pre-2015 references we left can be reasonably qualified as high-quality reference papers, regardless of the publication year. Of note, most of them are focused on KT technique and epidemiology, thus representing reference papers in this field.

- Minor weakness: the author said “In the setting of TRAT, CEUS is expected to provide a better representation of the presence and extent of renal infarction than grayscale US and Color Doppler US.” Actually, in the Figure 3, the Color Doppler US already showed the evidence of renal infarction. Why author use the word “better” here?

We thank the reviewer for the observation, which permitted us to correct an error. Indeed, Fig. 1c (the Color image) was acquired after contrast injection. The key message of that image is “CEUS enhances even Color Doppler signal, thus in turn helping better distinguishing hypoperfused areas”. We rearranged the order of the images and the figure legend accordingly.

- Minor weakness: the reference 5 and 56 are same, which should be revised.

We are sorry for the error. We eliminated the duplicated reference and renumbered the references accordingly.

3. Science Editor:

- The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered.

We tried to reply substantively to each observation/criticism as reported above.

- The CrossCheck detection showed a high similarity to published articles (total 5%). The authors need to rephrase the repeated sentences.

We rephrased the text were highlighted in the CrossCheck document, except for those sources of similarity consisting in the Authors' affiliation, names of techniques or medical societies (e.g., EFSUMB) or standard medical terminology that cannot be modified by definition (e.g., antecubital vein of the arm or the description of vascular anastomoses). Compared to the whole text, changes were minima, with no substantial changes in the review content.

- The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

We provided the original figures by arranging them into the required .ppt file.

Thank you again for considering our manuscript for the publication on the *World Journal of Radiology*.

Sincerely yours,

Prof. Rossano GIROMETTI, MD
Institute of Radiology
Department of Medicine – University of Udine
University Hospital S. Maria della Misericordia
Udine, Italy
Fax: +390432559867
Tel.: +390432559266
E-mail: rgirometti@sirm.org