# Response to reviewers (Round 2)

## Reviewer 1

The revised manuscript is significantly improved and much clearer. The authors have addressed all my comments.

A couple of minor notes, Figures 7 and 8 seem to have the descriptions swapped.

Also, Table 1 shows Subject 2 with 0 lesions. Was there a specific reason for including this subject in the study?

## Reviewer: 2

After reviewing the revised manuscript I believe it can now be accepted. Two minor issues: pp20-21: The formulas have errors i.e. false positive (FP) versus true negative (TN).

Also, the legends for figures 7 and 8 are swapped.

## Reviewer: 3

Regarding the “imaging" methodology, 3rd para, authors need to remove the information about JRS, and instead just indicate ‘how’ the work was performed, since authorship already implies these people did the work. For example, instead of "The first author (J. R. S.) performed the manual WMH tracings…” it probably should read something like “Manual WMH tracings were performed….”.