

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS

March 20, 2015

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 15629-review.doc).



Title: Perfusion computed tomography in renal cell carcinoma

Author: Chandan J Das, Usha Thingujam, Ananya Panda, Sanjay Sharma, Arun Kumar Gupta

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 15629

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

Reviewer 1:

This pictorial review describes the techniques and role of perfusion CT in staging and response assessment in patients with RCCs. However, there are some main drawbacks in the article that hinder its immediate publication by the WJR. - the content in term of CT perfusion is not really state-of-the-art, as many advanced techniques are not included, such as histogram analysis.

Response: Histogram analysis included

The references cited by the manuscript are too old, and most recent articles should be reviewed and covered.

Response: most recent articles are now covered.

- As a pictorial review, the figures are not sufficient to demonstrate the topic.

Response: We have converted this article into “review” from “pictorial review”

Reviewer 2:

Dear Author The topic is perfectly chosen. However, the construction is misleading. You are mixing the facts of a revision paper with the work in progress you are running.

Response: We have converted this article into “review” from “pictorial review”

Also, the salient feature of your article is the out dated references. If you did a pubmed search on related topics you will find a flow of new articles in last 5 years!!

Response: most recent articles are now covered.

Your figures are good but it will be interesting for a reading junior radiologist looking for updating his knowledge is to learn how to read these images and extract its data...even briefly.

Response: a brief paragraph on interpretation of CT perfusion is added newly

Also, I labeled many comments at their appropriate setting in the attached Pdf format as it lacks line labels. This critical review may help you to improve your work. Good luck Reviewer

Response: these changes are also incorporated. Thank you very much.

Reviewer 3:

Major comment: This manuscript deals with the role of perfusion CT in staging and treatment-response assessment of patients with renal cell carcinoma. It presents results of an “ongoing study”; nevertheless, I found it interesting to read.

Response: We have converted this article into “review” from “pictorial review”

Minor comments: Section “Perfusion CT: Technique”/“Our Institutional Protocol”, first sentence: The correct name of this town is “Erlangen” (instead of “Erlanger”) Please use consistent spelling for “tumor/tumour”

Response: these changes are also incorporated. Thank you very much.

Many spaces are missing (e.g. “anyactual”, “describesthe”...). Please write out abbreviated terms on first use (“MIP”, “ROI”).

Response: these changes are also incorporated. Thank you very much.

Dr Chandan J Das, MD, DNB, MNAMS, Assistant Professor,

Department of Radiology

All India Institute of Medical Sciences

Room no 63, Ansari Nagar

New Delhi 110029, India

docchandan17@gmail.com