DTI in BDII patients

I am overall satisfied with the way the authors addressed my comments and implemented the suggested changes. The manuscript reads well and its strength and relevance are definitely coming through. I have few final comments and editing suggestions that I am sure the authors will find easy to address.

-your discussion is way more thorough and insightful than in previous draft and you raise relevant issues. However, page 15 and page 16 could definitely be shortened and you could focus on the most relevant issues which are: what does the positive RD/AD correlation with age of onset really mean? Do these results suggest subclusters of patients based on age of onset? For instance, e.g. early vs late onset?

-page 15. Who came up with the differentiation of initial mood disorders in 4 groups? Your previous work? Not sure if talking about this here is a good choice. I would summarize it or discard this paragraph.

-page 5. BD II was already recognized and mentioned in the DSM-IV, why mention only DSM5?

-I would delete the sentence on cognitive heterogeneity: it is confusing and reads like a major logic leap since you didn’t talk about this in your introduction or elsewhere.

-wouldn’t a major future direction be a longitudinal study looking at changes in DTI parameters alongside clinical course of the disease? please consider addressing this.

-Table 4. Please correct alignment and font of your labels, e.g. (%pecificity (%

-Highlights: make it more precise, e.g. main fibers, fibers could be replaced with precise regions. Change Bipolar II patients instead of “the bipolar II…”. Clarify what DT means or replace this acronym.

Editing: please make sure to proofread this manuscript again. I noticed the following typos:

-abstract: please change “ Thus, In addition” to “Thus, in addition”

-page 5 (missing words). Bipolar disorder (BP-II) IS characterized….AND was initially…”

-page 12. Please add words: “there was a POSITIVE, and statistically significant correlation between the age of onset…”

-page 14. Accumulative evidence suggest (in this case verb remains plural)

-page 16. Missing word. This cross sectional study (DELETE TO) compared…

-page 17. Delete “actually”, too colloquial

- A minor note about describing results: …. the word ‘increased’ indicates a change over time, e.g. a longitudinal design or a comparison of stimuli within a task, e.g. “increased activation over time”. However, If you are comparing groups, use words such as greater or lower or slower or faster , etc. “Adults with BD have greater FA values etc.”. Please change this everywhere in the manuscript.