



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: 23483

Manuscript Type: Prospective Study

Manuscript number: 23483

Title: Assessment of sub-milli-sievert abdominal CT with iterative reconstruction techniques of different vendors

Reviver 1 (# 00058381)

Major Comments: This study has several limitations (as mentioned by the authors in the "Discussion"); therefore, the conclusion should be more restrictive; e.g., "...was not sufficient to retain clinical diagnostic performance in our study".

Response: Thank you very much for your suggestions. We have made suggested changes in conclusion and discussion section.

Please check the numbers; e.g., "There were total 49 "true positive" lesions on SD CT including kidney cysts (n=15), liver cyst (n=11), gall stones (n=4), diverticulosis (n=5), fatty liver (n=3), kidney stone (n=1), focal pancreatic lesion (n=1), splenomegaly (n=1), and other lesions (n=9) such as lymph nodes, paracolon abscess, low attenuating liver lesion, lytic lesion, and renal mass." (15+11+4+5+3+1+1+1+9 is not 49; page 11); or "Of 59 "true positive" on SD CT, there were kidney cysts (n=23), liver cysts (n=8), indeterminate liver lesions (n=3), cholelithiasis (n=3), diverticulosis (n=6), fatty liver (n=3), hernias (n=4), pancreatic lesions (n=2), splenomegaly (n=1), and other lesions (n=4) (lymph nodes, adrenal nodule, and enlarged prostate)." (23+8+3+3+6+3+4+2+1+4 is not 59; page 12). Table 2 is not included in the manuscript.

Response: Thank you very much. We have made corrections in the manuscript. We have also added the table 2.

Minor Comment: Please note that the plural of "diverticulum" is "diverticula", not "diverticuli" (page 13).

Response: Thank you very much. We have made correction in the result section.

Reviver 2 (#00225366)

This paper compared the image quality of reduced dose abdominal CT with 9 reconstruction techniques from 4 different vendors. They concluded that mean CTDIvol 1.3 mGy is not sufficient for clinical diagnostic performance. I have the following comments: 1. Please state the names of the vendors and use "A", "B" and "C" to label them without telling the readers which one is which. 2.

Response: Thank you so much for your comment. We have mentioned the name of three MDCT vendors in the materials and methods section.

The Conclusion is not very useful and we wanted to know the minimum CTDIvol for an acceptable image quality.

Response: Thank you so much for your suggestion. We have included the minimum CTDIvol for acceptable image quality in conclusion and discussion section.