Imaging Neuroscience #203: Responses to Editors and Reviewers

Editor

Dear Zhengguo Tan,

Thanks again for your submission. We would like to give you the opportunity to revise your paper.

This is a very minor revision request with only a couple of minor details remaining.

You can access reviews and submit your revision here: http://janeway.imaging-neuroscience.org/review/article/203/revisions/161/

Your revisions are due on Jan. 19, 2024.

Regards,
Bruce Pike

Imaging Neuroscience

Reviewer #1116

Authors have addressed most of my previous comments. Only exception could be the following:

Thank you for your constructive reviews in all rounds.

9) *A few pending points yet to be considered:*

9a) *L308: "We tested values of 0, 0.08, and 0.16", these should be changed by new values.*

Thank you. We corrected these values.

9b) *L319: "Here, the block width of 3 shows the best denoising as compared to 6 and 9, especially in the peripheral brain region"* $\rightarrow$ *but in Figure 6 you enhance block width of 6 as best case? Importantly, visually unclear which one is providing best denoising results now, so this may need a different reasoning or illustrative example.*

Thank you. We removed this sentence and added another illustrative example in Supporting Information to support the use of 6 as the block width.