

Responses to Reviewer Comments

We would first like to thank the reviewers for the very valuable insights and comments that contribute greatly to the improvement of the paper. We have done our best to address the comments from the reviewers in the revised manuscript and hope it is found to be acceptable to be published in the revised form. Below are specific responses to each of the comments by the reviewers.

Reviewer 1:

We thank the reviewer for finding the study to be very well designed and very well justified. We have done our best to address the remaining comments raised regarding data presentation, and hope it is now acceptable for publication.

Point 1: As shown in Table 3, the data are average values from many different samples. Therefore, it is important to describe information of the samples such as sample selection and number.

Response 1: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We have now included information about the sample selection process in Section 4.1 of the revised manuscript.

Point 2: It is necessary to show the related variability (standard deviations or standard errors) for the average values obtained. The data may be presented in an alternative way (such as a bar graph) for better comparison.

Response 2: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. To offer a better comparison of the methods, we have now presented the data as bar graphs as suggested (Figure 4 and 5) in Section 5 of the revised manuscript. Figure 4 compares AUC, specificity and sensitivity for all the methods in a bar graph form for ADC, with appropriate standard error bars along with average values to show related variability. Figure 5 compares AUC, specificity and sensitivity for all the methods in a bar graph form for CHB-DWI, with appropriate standard error bars along with average values to show related variability.