

Dear Reviewer and Editors:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Maple syrup urine disease: classic case reports of brain MRI findings and radiologic review" (ID: 58350). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as flowing:

Responds to the reviewer's comments:

1. According to your suggestion, I modified the title of the paper and added the key words ("case report" "brain imaging") you suggested. In this paper, we did a brief literature review, so I kept the keyword "review" in the title.
2. We supplemented the information of device manufacturer and a model used, and imaging regimen used in first paragraph of case history section.
3. We adjusted the font and size of table 1.
4. We added a description of the condition and frequency that brain (MR) imaging used for diagnosis of the MSUD in the second paragraph of discuss section. MRI should be conducted in all neonates who are suspected of MSUD before mass spectrometry analysis or genetic examinations are performed.

5. I have added relevant content in the conclusion section to answer the question which patient is eligible for brain MRI and when this examination should be performed.

6. In second paragraph of the discuss section, the specific MRI features were described in detail that namely a hyperintense signal on DWI and FLAIR sequences involving the globus pallidus, thalamus, internal capsule, brainstem, and cerebellar white matter.

7. According to your suggestion, MRI follow-up were detailed discussed in the third paragraph of the discuss section. More details about the cases also provided in this section.

8. We agree that the conclusion was too simple at present. Therefore, according to your suggestion we add partial content to explain how brain imaging influenced the disease flow.

9. Language polishing has been remade after the paper has been modified

10. We apologize for the typos in the paper. This error was corrected.

11. According to your suggestion, normal ranges of the mentioned laboratory markers in our paper were provided.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewer's warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions. In addition, we rephrase repeated sentences mentioned by the Science Editor. We add the PMID and DOI in the reference list, but some of the

literature is retrieved in other literature databases like ScienceDirect and SpringerLink, so they do not have PMID.