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Answer to Reviewer 2

Dear Madam/Sir,

Thank you so much for your valuable comments that helped us to improve by far our manuscript: “Vibration Response Imaging: evaluation of rater agreement in healthy subjects and subjects with pneumonia” by K. Bartziokas et al. Please find a point-by-point response to your comments.

On behalf of the authors, I would like to ask you to review this manuscript and to consider the possibility of acceptance for publication in the BMC Medical Imaging.

COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR (IN CAPITALS)

Response of the authors (lowercase in blue)

FIGURE 4 – IS THE LEGEND CORRECT FOR THE HISTOGRAMS? IN THE LEGEND, THE HEALTHY POPULATION IS INDICATED BY LIGHT GRAY; THEREFORE, A HIGHER PERCENTAGE OF HEALTHY SUBJECTS HAVE DYSNCHRONIZATION, ARTEFACTS AND ABNORMALITIES CORRESPONDING WITH CONSOLIDATION ON CHEST X-RAY. ALSO, ARE THERE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE HEALTHY AND PNEUMONIA POPULATION FOR THESE VRI FEATURES? IF SO, THEN THIS SHOULD BE INDICATED ON THE GRAPHS.

You are right that Figure 3 may be misleading. We tried to show Inter-rater agreement (%) per VRI feature evaluated in Figure 3 as it is stated in the relevant Figure Legend. Grey columns represent inter-rater agreement regarding images from healthy subjects as it is stated in the Figure. When a grey column is higher than the black one (i.e. in
the item “artefacts”), this means that inter-rater agreement in the evaluation of this item in images from healthy subjects was higher compared to inter-rater agreement in the evaluation of images from patients. Thus, columns do not represent number of artefacts or number of abnormalities.

We certainly agree that Figure could be improved. In light of your comment Figure 1 has been modified.

FIGURE 4 APPEARS AS FIGURE 4 IN THE TEXT, BUT AS FIGURE 3 IN THE FIGURE LEGENDS (PAGE 23). FIGURE LABELING IN TEXT SHOULD BE CHECKED WITH FIGURE LEGENDS.

Done as recommended.

PAGE 9 AND PAGE 10 OF NEW ARTICLE - WHAT DOES REFERENCE [45] REFER TO...NUMBERING IS UP TO 22 IN THE REFERENCE LIST?

You are right, this type error was corrected.

PAGE 11: INTER-RATER AGREEMENT % RANGE SHOULD BE (88%-100%).

Done as recommended.

THE NUMBER OF IMAGES THAT EACH OF THE REVIEWERS ASSESSED IS NOT STATED CLEARLY IN THE TEXT. I ASSUME THAT THE NUMBER IS 86 IMAGES (43*2), BUT THIS SHOULD BE STATED.

We have now added a relevant comment in Results section (Evaluation of VRI) TABLE 1 HAS A TYPO AND SHOULD BE WRITTEN AS "PARTICIPANTS".

Done as recommended.