

Response to reviewers

Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript ID: 58036

Manuscript Type: Case Report

Manuscript Title: Diffusion-Weighted Imaging Might Be Useful for Reactive Lymphoid Hyperplasia Diagnosis of the Liver: A Case Report

Editor,

We thank the reviewers for their detailed and thorough assessment of our manuscript. The manuscript was formatted to conform to WJCC. The comments were constructive, and we have made multiple additions to the paper as a result. We hope you will continue to review our manuscript. If any changes are necessary after the review, we shall make additional revisions.

Best regards,

Dr. Taro Tanaka

Department of Radiology, Tokyo Medical University

Nishi-Shinjuku 1600023, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo,, Japan

Telephone; +81-3-3342-6111

Facsimile; +81-3-3342-6314

E-mail; gossip.auction@hotmail.co.jp

Response to reviewer #1

This is well written case report. This manuscript focused on linear periportal hyperintensity on DWI adjacent to nodular shaped reactive lymphoid hyperplasia in the liver. I agree that this finding may reflect lymphoplasmacytic infiltration along the portal tract and may be helpful to differentiate RLH from other malignant entities.

1. The patient had three nodules. Did all three nodules show linear periportal hyperintensity on DWI?
2. Please consider addition of more images including CT and portal or equilibrium phase of MR.

Reply

Thank you for your comments.

1. We were able to detect linear periportal hyperintensity on DWI in all three lesions. However, the image on S2 was deteriorated by the beating heart. Hence, we had to focus attention more than usual attention to recognize it. We added the following sentence to Imaging examinations section (P5, L20-21).

“There was linear hyperintensity along the portal tract consecutive to the liver lesions on DWI (Fig. 2c,3d). However, that of S2 lesion was faint, because of the beating heart and susceptibility artifact.”
2. We followed your suggestion and added CT (Fig. 1a-d) and MRI (Fig. 2a-f).

Response to Editorial Office's comments

1) Science Editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the diagnosis of RLH on DWI. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This is well written case report. This manuscript focused on linear periportal hyperintensity on DWI adjacent to nodular shaped reactive lymphoid hyperplasia in the liver. Please consider addition of more images including CT and portal or equilibrium phase of MR. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 2 figures. A total of 20 references are cited, including 3 references published in the last 3 years. There is 1 self-citation.

Reply:

We have replied the reviewer's comments.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by Enago was provided.

Reply:

We have added the following sentence to the Acknowledge section.

“The authors would like to thank Enago (www.enago.jp) for the English language review.”

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, written informed consent, and the CARE checklist form. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. The highest single-source similarity index in the CrossCheck report showed to be 10%. According to our policy, the overall similarity index should be less than 30%, and the single-source similarity should be less than 5%. Please rephrase these repeated sentences.

Reply:

We have rephrased as much as possible. We have used blue highlights to mark the parts that were rephrased.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study is without financial support. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG.

No reply

5 Issues raised: (1) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. 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; (2) I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and (3) I found the “Case Presentation” did not meet our requirements. Please re-write the “Case Presentation” section, and add “FINAL DIAGNOSIS”, “TREATMENT”, and “OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP” section to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision.

Reply:

- (1) We followed your suggestions and uploaded the original picture in PowerPoint format.
- (2) We have added the PMID and DOI to all references except for references 1, 3, and 17. We could not locate the DOIs of these references.
- (3) We followed your suggestion and reconstructed our manuscript in accordance with the guideline.

6 Re-Review: Required.

7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

No reply

2) Editorial Office Director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

3) Company Editor-in-Chief: I recommend the manuscript to be published in the World Journal of Clinical Cases.

Reply:

We hope that this paper will be published in World Journal of Clinical Cases.