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Reviewers report:

The manuscript is devoted to evaluation of an interesting new diagnostic technique that has two potential advantages: no radiation and bedside availability. I would like to provide some comments:

1. The question posed by the authors is well defined, the manuscript is dealing with evaluation of quality and interpretability of the new technique (VRI)
2. The methods for the evaluation are appropriate and well described in details although lack of a radiologist included in the interpretation of the study poses a problem in the reliability of the reference (chest radiograph/CT) for the final diagnosis of pneumonia.
3. The data seems to be solid.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? - Yes
5. The discussion and conclusion are very logical and based on the data with relevant references provided in discussion
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   There some points that I think need to be addressed:
   a. the technique in novel and really interesting, but evaluation of 20 healthy and 23 sick (pneumonia) patients is not sufficient just based on the number of cases and a larger cohort of patients need to be evaluated on a prospective basis.
   b. It is not clear for me if there is any way to distinguish between pneumonia, atelectasis, aspiration or hemorrhage based on this technique. Although this differentiation is not always possible on the basis of conventional radiography, it still can be done in many cases.
   c. Further validation of this technique might be based on comparison with computer tomography to evaluate the specificity of the technique rather than sensitivity.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes, as I stated, the prior work is nicely depicted in the references
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? The paper is nicely written
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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