Iranian Journal of Radiology
Volume 18 · Issue 4 · e112648

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Application of Diffusion Tensor Imaging in the Evaluation of Brain Injury in Premature Infants with Low and Very Low Birth Weight

Dalin Zhu, Manxia Wang, Fan Feng, Nan Nan, Yuefen Liu, Jinyun Shi, Baohong Mao

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
10 Jan 2021	6 Jul 2021	7 Jul 2021	10.5812/iranjradiol.112648

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 21
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 22
Authors' reply to reviewers 23
Reviewer and editor comments 46

1 Original submission

2 comments · 19 Jan 2021 – 6 Mar 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 19 Jan 2021

Methodologically, it can be said that the statistical analysis and scientific writing of the study are relatively appropriate, but it is necessary to pay attention to the following points:
1. Inconsistency of the study title with its design: The study has a case-control design, which is used to compare cases and controls in terms of the variable(s) of interest to the researcher to examine their relationship with the study outcome. However, the title of the study and its purpose were written to reflect a cross-sectional design, and the selection of a control group was not necessary. As a result, it is necessary to determine whether the purpose is characterization or determination of etiology.
2. Sample size: Explain the formula, the statistical assumptions, and the values used for the calculation in the response file to the reviewer, not in the manuscript file. In addition, by performing a statistical test, the study power must be reported based on the most important variable.
3. The manuscript file should be compiled according to the IJR instructions and with the appropriate scientific writing structure. In the abstract section, only the main and important results should be reported, not all the findings. In the text, when a variable is compared between two groups, the value for each group must also be reported in addition to the significance.
4. In the methods section of the abstract and the full text, the type of study should be stated in terms of its design.
5. The study ethics code should be included in the full text.
6. Was the body mass index value considered in the selection of the control group?
7. In Table 1, the critical value column of the test should be removed, and a special symbol should be used for the significant value of each test and explained below the table. In addition, report the percentage value of each variable.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 6 Mar 2021

Dear authors,
Your article needs Major Revision.
Regards

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Responds to the reviewer’s comments:

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Reviewer #1:

1. Response to comment: (*Inconsistency of the study title with its design: The study design is case-control that this design is used to compare the case and the control in terms of the variable (s) of the researcher to examine their relationship with the outcome of the study. However, the title of the study and its purpose were written cross-sectionally and the selection of the control group was not necessary. As a*

result, it is necessary to determine whether the purpose is to characterize or to determine the etiology.)

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes,We have made correction according to the reviewer's comments in our paper.Oursudy title "Correlation of diffusion tensor imaging and brain injury in premature infants with low and very low birth weight" were corrected as "Application of diffusion tensor imaging in the evaluation of brain injury in premature infants with with low and very low birth weight ".

2. Response to comment: (*Sample size: Explain about the formula, the statistical assumptions and the values that used for the calculation, in*

the response file to the reviewer, not in the manuscript file. In addition, by performing a statistical test, the thestudy power must be reported based on the most important variable.).

We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, we have made correction according to the reviewer's comments.This is the sample size formula:

$$n=\frac{\left(u_{\alpha}+u_{\beta}\right)^{2}(1+1/k)\sigma^{2}}{\delta^{2}}$$

α=0.05,uα=1.960.

β=0.1,uβ=1.2826,K=1,σ=0.027,δ=0.023

result n=30.

Our study sampel is 31 cases.

We have made correction in the abstract and reported based on the

most important variable.

3. Response to comment: (*The manuscript file should be compiled according to the IJR instructions and also with the appropriate scientific writing structure. In the abstract section, only the main and important results should be reported, not all the findings. In the text, when a variable is compared between two groups, in addition to the significance, the value of each group must also be reported.*).

We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, we have made correction according to the reviewer's comments.In the abstract section,we deleted the unimportant results and corrected as "The fractional anisotropy (FA) values of central white matter of occipital lobe,central white matter of frontal lobe, centrum semiovale, posterior limb of internal capsule(PLIC), and ventral thalamus in the brain injury

group were significantly lower than those of the control group (P<0.05); ADC values were low compared with the control group, there was a statistical difference (P<0.05). FA and ADC values was no significant difference between the BIPI with LBW and the VLBW groups in central white matter of occipital lobe,central white matter of frontal lobe,centrumsemiovale,PICI,and ventral thalamus (P > 0.05)".

In the text,we have made correction according to the reviewer's comments.such as "The FA values of central white matter of frontal lobe in the BIPI group was 0.110±0.036 vs. 0.129±0.016 (P=0.000) in the control group, central white matter of occipital lobe was 0.141±0.039 vs. 0.164±0.035 (P= 0.007) , centrum semiovale was 0.151±0.027 vs. 0.174±0.037 (P= 0.006), PLIC was 0.383±0.111 vs. 0.501±0.065 (P=0.000), ventral thalamus was 0.156±0.033 vs. 0.182±0.162 (P=0.011).See Table 2.

The ADC values of central white matter of frontal lobe in the BIPI group was 1.863±0.172 vs. 1.780±0.168 (P=0.040) in the control group, central white matter of occipital lobe was 1.771±0.118 vs. 1.670±0.132 (P= 0.012) , centrum semiovale was 1.712±0.192 vs. 1.599±0.162 (P= 0.032), PLIC was 1.170±0.098 vs. 1.122±0.139 (P=0.033), ventral thalamus was 1.119±0.087 vs. 1.057±0.069 (P=0.009).See Table 3. ”in the result 4.2.,

“The FA values of central white matter of frontal lobe in the VLBW group was 0.104±0.015 vs. 0.116±0.047 (P=0.782) in the LBW group, central white matter of occipital lobe was 0.138±0.040 vs. 0.144±0.040 (P= 0.429) , centrum semiovale was 0.146±0.028 vs. 0.155±0.027 (P= 0.206), PLIC was 0.401±0.112 vs. 0.366±0.112 (P=0.398), ventral thalamus was 0.159±0.033 vs. 0.153±0.034 (P=0.638).See Table 4.

The ADC values of central white matter of frontal lobe in theVLBW group was 1.885±0.121 vs. 1.842±0.212 (P=0.767) in the LBW group, central white matter of occipital lobe was 1.796±0.091 vs. 1.747±0.138 (P= 0.429) , centrum semiovale was 1.719±0.180 vs. 1.705±0.208 (P= 0.874), PLIC was 1.172±0.101 vs. 1.169±0.099 (P=0.924), ventral thalamus was 1.095±0.074 vs. 1.148±0.034 (P=0.105).See Table 5. ”in the result 4.3.

4. Response to comment: (*In the method section of the abstract and the full text, the type of study should be written in terms of design.*).

We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, we have made correction according to the reviewer’s comments.We have added the type of study “A prospective study” in the method section of the abstract and the full text.

5. Response to comment: (*The code of study ethics should be included in the full text.*).

We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, we have added the code of study ethics“2020(5)”at correct locationintheMethod andFootnotesin the full text.

6. Response to comment: (*Was the body mass index value considered in the selection of the control group?*).

We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, we just considered the birth weight in our study,and we found there were no statistics in the two groups in birth weight. See Table 1.We will accept your good advise in another paper in our study.

7. Response to comment: (*In Table 1, the critical value column of*

the test is removed and a special symbol is used for the significant value of each test and is explained below the table. In addition, write the percentage value of each variable.

).

We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, we have made correction according to the reviewer's comments. We have removed the critical value column of the test andaddede a special symbol and explained below the table,and added the percentage value of each variable in Table 1.

Reviewer #2:

Response to comment: (*Please explain what "NABA" stands for (In the part "Methods, Subject").*

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, We have made correction according to the reviewer's comments.Wecorrected as "Theneonatal behavioral neurological assessment(NBNA)was accepted , The total score of NBNA scores is 40 point.The NBNA score in the control group was > 37 point in the follow-up for 1 month ."

Reviewer #3:

1.Response to comment: (*The last sentence in abstract method in unclear.).*

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes.The statements of "The differences of FA and ADC values between BIPI with nomalcontrolgroup,BIPI with

LBW and VLBW, and different research barain region innomal control were analyzed ” were corrected as “The differences of FA and ADC values between BIPI group and control group,BIPI with LBW group and VLBW group were analyzed. The FA and ADC values in different barain region in control group were analyzed”.

2.Response to comment: (*line18: different research barain region).*

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthesemistakes.The words of “*different research barain region*” were corrected as“differentbarain region”.

3.Response to comment: (*line 78: dictation of birth weight).*

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes,

We have made correction according to the reviewer's comments.The words of "*birth weight*" were corrected as"birth weight".

4.Response to comment: (*line 85: grammar).*

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, We have made correction according to the reviewer's comments. The statements of "MRI and follow-up data incomplete; died or gave up treatment less than 24 hoursafter admission" were corrected as"the data of MRI or follow-up was incomplete; died during the follow-up period".

5.Response to comment: (*line 117,118: the sentence doesn't have verb).*

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes,

We have made correction according to the reviewer's comments. We have added "is" and "is according to" to the sentence.

6.Response to comment: (*line121: EXCEL soft?).*

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, We have corrected "*EXCEL soft"*as "EXCEL software".

7.Response to comment: (*Figure1:legand c ,FA shows the imaging of the white matter fiberbundles in the normal basal ganglia?)*

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, The statements of "*FA shows the imaging of the white matter fiberbundles in the normal basal ganglia*" were corrected as "FA map shows the white matter fiber tracts imaging in the normal basal ganglia".

8.Response to comment: (*line172: dictation premature).*

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, the words of “*preture*” were corrected as “premature”.

9.Response to comment: (*Line201,202: unclear and has grammar errors).*

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, We have made correction according to the reviewer’s comments. The statements of “*Children with brain injury were significantly lower than the control group, and the ADC value of preterm infants with brain injury was higher than that of the control group*.” were corrected as “In most studies[14,15,16],the FAvalue of BIPI were significantly lower than the normal infants, and the ADC value of BIPI was higher than the normal

infants".

10 . Response to comment: (*Line 204: unclear, wrong).*

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, We have made correction according to the reviewer's comments,corrected"some scholars [17, 18] believe that the changes in DTI parameters haveno correlation with the degree of preterm labor and white matter damage"as"some scholars [17, 18] believe that the ADC value have no correlation with the degree of white matter damage in premature infants."

11.Response to comment: (*I cannot understand your meaning of these sentences:*

Line 232,233: It reflects that prematurebabies have a small gestational

age and there is a certain sequence of development.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, We have made correction according to the reviewer’s comments. The statements of “*It reflects that prematurebabies have a small gestational age and there is a certain sequence of development.*” were corrected as “It reflects that the FA and ADC value should reflect the development of the brain of premature infants.”

Line 250,251:The main influencing factors in children's brain injury are mainly related to the type and severity of brain injury??).

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence ofthese mistakes, we havedeleted the statements of “*The main influencing factors in children's*

brain injury are mainly related to the type and severity of brain injury?”for inappropriate description.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 17 Apr 2021 – 20 Jun 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 17 Apr 2021

Thanks to the dear authors for their comprehensive revision of the manuscript draft.
Currently, this submission is methodologically acceptable and is therefore ready for publication in the IJR.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 20 Jun 2021

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Responds to the reviewer’s comments:

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Responds to the reviewer’s comments:

Reviewer 1:

Thanks from dear authors for comprehensive edition of manuscript draft.

Currently, this submission is acceptable according to methodically; and so, it is ready for publication in the IJR.

Response: Thanks a lot for Reviewers’ warm work.

Reviewer 2:

Dear author

The changes that I suggest were made but :

Line 314: in figure1.C legend, you write FA map shows the white

matter fiber tracts imaging in the normal basal ganglia but I think you should write FA map shows the white matter fiber tracts imaging in the normal posterior limb of internal capsule.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, have made correction according to the reviewer's comments in our paper. "FA map shows the white matter fiber tracts imaging in the normal basal ganglia" were corrected as "FA map shows the white matter fiber tracts imaging in the normal posterior limb of internal capsule " in figure1.C legend .

Reviewer 3:
In figure 3 the image A is DWI not T1W. Please correct the image legend.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes,

“T1W” were corrected as “DWI ” In figure 3 the image A legend.

Responds to the Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Thanks to the authors for appropriate changes in their manuscript draft , Now , the manuscript with ID 112648 is nearly ready for publication in IJR, please also consider revision for some minor mistakes as implied by reviewer ,

Response: Thanks a lot for Reviewers’ warm work. We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, have made correction according to the reviewer’s comments in our paper.

Associate Editor 2:

Please consult with an expert editor. The paper needs a heavy work of English edition. Most of sentences are inappropriate and should be edited both regarding the scientific writing style and English writing style.

1-please correct: “premature infants (BIPI)” [in line 3 abstract, add space before infants].

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, we have add space before infants.

2-there is two “with” in title. Please correct.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, we have deleted.

3-this sentence is not appropriately written: “Seek a better way to early diagnosis, treatment, and intervention are important for children with BIPI by DTI” it could be written for example as: “Finding a better way for early diagnosis, treatment and intervention is important in these children that could be done by DTI”

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes,

“Seek a better way to early diagnosis, treatment, and intervention are important for children with BIPI by DTI” were corrected as “Finding a better way for early diagnosis, treatment and intervention is important in these children that could be done by DTI”.

4-please add full term of abbreviations in the first usage [in abstract and main text separately]. For example, LBW, FA, ADC, …. [please abbreviate in the first time the word is mentioned, not in the later times]

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, “LBW” were corrected as “low birth weight（LBW）″, “VLBW” were corrected as “ very low birth weight（VLBW）″,“FA” were corrected as

“the fractional anisotropy(FA)”, “ADC” were corrected as “apparent diffusion coefficient(ADC)”.

5-in line 11 abstract, please change: “prematureinfants(BIPI)” to “BIPI”

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, “prematureinfants(BIPI)” were corrected as “BIPI”.

6-please delete application in line 13.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, we have deleted “application”.

7-what is the meaning of this part: “DTI examination at term

postmenstrual age(PMA)" what is the meaning of term postmenstrual age? Patients are premature.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, "at term postmenstrual age(PMA)" mean "corrected gestational age ", "DTI examination at term postmenstrual age(PMA)" were corrected as "DTI examination at postmenstrual age(PMA)".

8-this sentence seems unclear and incoherent: "The differences of FA and ADC values between BIPI with normal control group, BIPI with LBW and VLBW, and different research barain region in normal control were analyzed." The first part mentions the comparison of FA and ADC values between difeerent groups while the second part

does not mention comparison between different groups.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes,“The differences of FA and ADC values between BIPI with normal control group, BIPI with LBW and VLBW, and different research barain region in normal control were analyzed” were corrected as “The differences of FA and ADC values between BIPI with normal control group, BIPI with LBW and VLBW were analyzed. The differences FA and ADC values and different barain region of research in normal control were analyzed”.

9-please correct the whole paper by a native editor. Many sentences are not appropriate. For example: “FA and ADC values

was no significant difference between the BIPI with LBW ….." that should be: "comparison of FA and ADC values between the BIPI with LBW, …….. did not show statistically significant difference."

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes and we have corrected the whole paper,such as"FA and ADC values was no significant difference between the BIPI with LBW and the VLBW groups in central white matter of frontal lobe,central white matter ofoccipital lobe,centrum semiovale,PLIC,and ventral thalamus (P > 0.05)" were corrected as "Comparison of FA and ADC values in central white matter of frontal lobe,central white matter of occipital lobe,centrum semiovale,PLIC,and ventral thalamus between the BIPI with LBW group

and VLBW group, FA and ADC values did not show statistically significant difference".

10-this term is wrong: ".....in the evaluation of BIPI with LBW". It could be for example: "in the evaluation of BIPI in LBW infants".

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, "in the evaluation of BIPI with LBW" were corrected as "in the evaluation of BIPI in LBW infants".

11-in the line 40, what is the meaning of "clear imaging,"? please clarify and correct.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes,

"*clear imaging*" were corrected as "multi-directional imaging".

12-what is the meaning of following sentence? "Most studies have not grouped premature infants by birth weight, and there are few reports on LBW and VLBW prematureinfants[1,3]" please clarify.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, "*Most studies have not grouped premature infants by birth weight, and there are few reports on LBW and VLBW prematureinfants[1,3]*" were corrected as "A fewer reports on application of DTI in the evaluation of BIPI with LBW and VLBW*[1,3]*".

13-in lines 45 and 46: "…. further explores the correlation of DTI and BIPI with LBW and VLBW…." This part is written inappropriate. It could be: "……furtherly it explores findings of DTI in LBW and VLBW premature infants with brain injury"

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, "further explores the correlation of DTI and BIPI with LBW and VLBW" were corrected as "furtherly it explores findings of DTI in LBW and VLBW premature infants with brain injury".

14-please write the paper by compete sentences. This sentence is

not appropriate: "Divided the BIPI group into two subgroups according to body weight: LBW group (1500g≤weight≤2500g), VLBW group (1000g≤weight<1500g)."

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, "further explores the correlation of DTI and BIPI with LBW and VLBW" were corrected as "furtherly it explores findings of DTI in LBW and VLBW premature infants with brain injury".

15-please delete "Control group:" at the beginning of line 66.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, we

have deleted *“Control group:”.*

16-please delete “Clinical data information collection:” at the beginning of line 76. You can write instead: “items of clinical information gathered during the study included: ……. ”

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, “Clinical data information collection:” were corrected as “items of clinical information gathered during the study included:”.

17-at the beginning of line 80, please change “ Exclusion criteria:” to “ Exclusion criteria were as follows:”

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, “Exclusion criteria:” were corrected as “Exclusion criteria were as follows:”.

18-please write the manufacturer data of SPSS.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, “SPSS19.0 software” were corrected as “SPSS 19.0 statistics （IBM,USA）”.

19-which statistical test was used for checking normality of data?

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, we

have added “ Shapiro-Wilk test was used for checking normality of data” in the paper.

20-line 125; “count data” should be “nominal data” or “nominal variables”

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, “count data” were corrected as “nominal data”.

21-line 131: this part is meaningless “There were no statistics in the two groups in terms of gender, ….”

It should be: “There were no statistically significant difference

between the two groups in terms of gender, ….."

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, "There were no statistics in the two groups in terms of gender" were corrected as "There were no statistically significant difference between the two groups in terms of gender".

22-title 4.2 should be: "4.2 comparison of FA and ADC values between BIPI and control groups". Please follow similar format in titles 4.2 and 4.3, ……

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, "The relationship between the FA and ADC values of the BIPI and control group." were corrected as "comparison of FA and ADC values between BIPI and control groups" in 4.2.

"The relationship between the FA and ADC value of the LBW and

VLBW groups with BIPI” were corrected as “comparison of FA and ADC values with BIPI between LBW and VLBW groups” in 4.3.

“The FA and ADC value relationship between the LBW and VLBW grouop in the control group.” were corrected as “comparison of FA and ADC values between LBW and VLBW groups in the control group” in 4.4.

23-please delete “See Table 1” and replace it with “(Table 1)”. Please apply similar format for next instances.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, “See Table 1” were corrected as “Table 1”,“See Table 2” were corrected as “Table2”,“See Table 3” were corrected as “Table3”, “See Table 4” were corrected as “Table 4”, “See Table 5” were corrected as “Table 5” ,See Table 6” were corrected as “Table 6”

“See Figure 1” were corrected as “Figure 1”, “See Figure 2” were

corrected as “Figure 2”, “See Figure 3” were corrected as “Figure 3”.

24- P=0.000 is wrong. It should be P<0.001.

We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, all“P=0.000” were corrected as “P<0.001”.

25-writing style of whole part of 4.4 is not correct. Please correct.

[lines 237-240 have similar pattern. Please correct]

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, “The FA value of the control group is different in each part, PLIC > ventral thalamus > centrum semiovale > central white matter of occipital lobe > central white matter of frontal lobe; The ADC values are also different in each part, PLIC < ventral thalamus < centrum semiovale < central white matter of occipital lobe < central white matter of frontal lobe” were corrected as “The FA value of PLIC is higher than ventral

thalamus,centrum semiovale,central white matter of occipital lobe,central white matter of frontal lobe; The ADC values of PLIC is lower than ventral thalamus,centrum semiovale,central white matter of occipital lobe,central white matter of frontal lobe” in 4.4.

“This study shows that the FA value of the control group is different in each part, PLIC > ventralthalamus > centrumsemiovale > central white matter of occipital lobe > central white matter of frontal lobe. The ADC value is also different in each part, PLIC < ventralthalamus < centrumsemiovale < central white matter of occipital lobe < central white matter of frontal lobe.” were corrected as “This study showed that the FA value of PLIC is higher than ventral thalamus,centrum semiovale,central white matter of occipital lobe,central white matter of frontal lobe; The ADC values of PLIC is lower than ventral thalamus,centrum semiovale,central white matter of occipital lobe,central white matter of frontal lobe” in *lines 237-240.*

26-please define full term of abbreviations as footnote in tables; for example, FA, BIPI, ADC, LBW, …. In tables 2, 3 ..

We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes,we have added all define full term of abbreviations as footnote in tables In tables 2, 3.4,5,6.

27-please correct figure 1 legend as: "Figure 1: A Female newborn with 33 weeks of gestation, birth weight of 1350g and corrected gestational age of 38 weeks that is a normal premature infant". Please apply similar format in other images.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes,we have corrected all similar format in our paper,like "Figure 1:Female, 33 weeks of gestation, birth weight of 1350g, corrected gestational age of 38 weeks, normal premature infant" were corrected as "Figure 1: A Female newborn with 33 weeks of gestation, birth weight of 1350g and corrected gestational age of 38 weeks that is a normal premature infant"，

"Figure 2，A Female, 33 weeks of gestation with BIPI, birth weight

of 2300g, corrected gestational age of 38 weeks" were corrected as "Figure 2，A Female newborn with 33 weeks of gestation, birth weight of 2300g and corrected gestational age of 38 weeks that is a BIPI."

"Figure 3: Female, 29 weeks gestation, birth weight 1469g, corrected gestational age 38 weeks, BIPI with VLBW" were corrected as "Figure 3: A Female newborn with 29 weeks gestation, birth weight 1469g and corrected gestational age 38 weeks that is a BIPI with VLBW"

28-what is SWI in fig 2 legend. Please define. What does mean axis in this legend?

We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, "SWI" were corrected as "Susceptibility Weighted Imaging(SWI)". "axis" means "magnetic resonance axial imaging".

29-In figure 3 the image A is DWI not T1W. Please correct the image legend.

We are very sorry for our negligence of these mistakes, "TWI" were

corrected as “DWI”.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 7 Jul 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 7 Jul 2021

Dear authors,
Your article is acceptable for publication in IJR.
Regards