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Dear prof. Rasha,

You submitted the manuscript ID AJGH-2412-1073, " **Magnetic resonance enterography (MRE) in Crohn’s disease: How we do it and common imaging findings**," to the African Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology. The reviewer's comments (s) are included at the end of this email.

The reviewers have requested revisions to your manuscript.  Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewers' comments and revise your manuscript. Instructions on how to do this can be found at the bottom of this email.

Because we are trying to facilitate the timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the African Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, your revised manuscript should be submitted as soon as possible.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the African Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology. I look forward to your revision.

Sincerely,

Salem Y Mohamed

Chief Editor, African Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology

Please revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer.  Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document using the track changes mode in MS Word or using bold or colored text.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can send it to me via email.

When submitting your revised manuscript, please provide your responses and details of changes made to each comment in an Author Response Letter.  To expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewers.

**Reviewer Comments to Author:**

**Reviewer1: interventional radiologist**

In this manuscript, the authors discuss the imaging findings of magnetic resonance enterography (MRE) in treating Crohn’s disease. The work is exciting because the accurate diagnosis of the disease and its complications will help in good management. We have a few comments to improve the quality of the work:

A) Abstract:
- should contain a patient and methods section.

B) In the Methodology:
Patient enrollment:
- Toy should be the exact period of study.
Pitfalls:
-You mentioned: “Nevertheless MRE may be more acceptable to patients than intubation, inadequate bowel loop distention can be countered frequently with inability to identify partial bowel strictures good…..Please clarify this sentence.
C) In the manuscript writing:
- The English language of the manuscript needs revision.
- In the Discussion section: Please write down the limitations of your study and if any restriction was encountered.

**Reviewer 2: (gastroenterologist)**

What is the aim of the study?

Where are the subjects and methods?

What is the study design? It is observational, not prospective

Where was the study carried out?

**Reviewer 3: gastroenterologist**

The authors investigated the role of MRE in managing CD, and we have some comments.
A- In the research methodology:
The aim of the current study is missing or unclear. What does the author need to investigate?
- “All included cases were patients with histologically proven Crohn’s disease who were scheduled to undergo MR enterography for symptom exacerbation.” Is this an inclusion criterion?
-
B- In the manuscript writing:
- It seems that a junior author wrote the article, and it should be re-written by a senior author
- The methods section, especially describing the MRI technique and the definitions, needs extensive revision and shortening
The current study does not clearly describe how patients were managed. It should clearly describe how patients were approached, e.g., by Hx, examinations, labs, imaging …etc.
- Ethical issues and IRB approval number should have a separate heading
- Many language and grammar mistakes (please check the attached Word file)
The results section needs to be divided into sections, e.g., patient characteristics, MRE findings….etc.
- Discussion should be focused on the current study results in comparison to the literature

Check the uploaded file.

**Reviewer 4: biostatistician**

What value do this work add? It is just a description of MRE findings. How can you reach a conclusion based on that work? Vague objectives. The methodology section lacks many details. I think this work needs improvement.

Check the uploaded file.

**Editor Comments to Author:**

1. Please check the author names and affiliations included on your Title Page, mainly that the spelling of all authors' names is correct. They are cited in the order you wish them to appear in the final article. In addition, each author's affiliation details are correct.

2. Please include a 'Structured Abstract': not more than 250 words, broken down into, i.e., Aims, Patients & Methods/Materials & Methods, Results, and Conclusions. For authors presenting the results of clinical trials, the guidelines recommended by CONSORT should be followed when writing the abstract (http://www.consort-statement.org/), and the clinical trial registration number should be included at the end of the abstract, where available.

3. Please include up to 10 keywords in your revised manuscript (including the four keywords you selected as part of the submission process).

4. Please amend the references as per the author's guidelines:

a. References should be numerically listed in the reference section in the order they occur in the text.

b. References should appear as a number, i.e., [1, 2] in the text.

c. References should cite three authors et al.: It is our house style to list a maximum of six authors and, if there are more than this, three authors et al.

5. Please ensure all tables and boxes are titled and cited in the text. Three-line tables are preferred.

Please find a link to the African Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology Author Guidelines, which explains these sections in more detail: <https://ajgh.journals.ekb.eg/journal/authors.note>.

6. Please check the PDF file of your manuscript regarding plagiarism checking.

7. Please add the scale bar, annotations, magnifications, and program that generated these figures. Also, it is better to submit figures with high resolution and brightness.