



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 Radiology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 22504

Manuscript Type: FRONTIER

Response to Reviewers

Manuscript Number 22504

Manuscript Title: Brainstem Tegmental Lesions in neonates: MR diagnosis and clinical outcome

Reviewer 00713469

Comments To Authors: GENERAL COMMENTS The authors present an interesting paper on brainstem tegmental lesions in neonates with hypoxic-ischemic encephalopathy. They used MR for diagnosis and repercussions of findings on clinical outcome. The manuscript represents an attempt to further improve the state of art. The paper is well written and structured correctly. The method applied is strong and it merits to be discussed. The design of the manuscript is appropriate and the ideas sound. Positive comments and minor essential revisions ? Proper title ? The introduction has been structured accordingly to the aim of the paper. ? Tables and/or figures: appropriately showed ? No English language check. ? References appropriate. Type errors. They are displayed un-homogenously. Please provide!.

Response: We thank the reviewer for the comments. Type errors were corrected in the references.

Reviewer 00214317

Comments To Authors: The manuscript is well written.

Response: We thank the reviewer for the positive comments. No changes were applied to the manuscript.

Reviewer 00227565

Comments To Authors: The authors' highlighted the importance of recognizing brain stem tegmental lesions, its patho-physiologic mechanisms and its consequences on early rehabilitation programs and parents consultancy of those infants. Here are few comments

aiming to improve the manuscript: Under the paragraph head "Involvement of Brainstem in HIE and MR Diagnosis" The sentence stating the intrinsic limitations of MR imaging in posterior cranial fossa looks for me non-sense as all we know the unprecedented visualization of posterior fossa structures on MR even the cranial nerves within the petrous bone after the limitations of old single slice CT. In the next paragraph it is substantia nigra not "substantial". The section of "Involvement of Brainstem in HIE and MR Diagnosis" is too lengthy and contains a lot of data from previous autopsy and pathophysiologic studies so the reader is easily got lost...Kindly this section need to be summarized to the targets. The remaining sections are clearly written apart from some typos like those in "Figure legends" section: Figure-1: it is history not " hystory". Figure-2: it is iodinated not "iodated". Another point for Figure-3: kindly point to the findings in pannel "J" The references are good but need to be reduced for a fronteir type of studies. The figures are adequate and translate the authors idea.

Response:

- According to the reviewer's comment, the sentence "...to the intrinsic limitations of MR imaging in posterior cranial fossa..." was deleted.
- "substantial" has been changed to "substantia"
- The section "Involvement of Brainstem in HIE and MR Diagnosis" has been shortened
- The text has been rechecked for typos and corrected.
- Arrows were added on panel J in Figure 3.
- The references have been reduced from #60 to #45.

Reviewer 02577402

Comments to Authors: The authors investigated the brainstem tegmental lesions in neonates with hypoxic-ischemic encephalopathy in the MR diagnosis and clinical outcome. Some problems existed. 1. Key words: Please include Magnetic resonance diagnosis as a key word. 2. Structure of the article: The structure is not clear. In the text, the Introduction should briefly introduce the background and problems in neonates in the brainstem tegmentum. However, some subheadings follow the INTRODUCTION. I am not sure where the INTRODUCTION part ended. Moreover, some parts are extremely short while others are extremely long and confusing. Please add some more subheadings to the long parts so that the readers can be sure what you are talking about. 3. Language: The language needs to be improved.

Response: We thank the reviewer for the comments.

- magnetic resonance was added as key word
- INTRODUCTION heading has been removed

- Headings are similar in length in the new revised version of the manuscript; also we noticed that several paragraphs were confusing for the reader: several changes have been applied to the manuscript to improve its structure.

To the Editor:

- English Language has been cross-checked by a native speaker in our institution.