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Reviewer's report:

General

This is an interesting paper that bridges, for the first time, the topic of incidental findings (Fs) in brain imaging and self-referral to imaging "brain docking." I thought it was most intriguing and would like to see it published. It provides normative data on IFs, calculations of false positives, and screening cost estimates. An admirable goal and effort.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. The abstract and conclusion need to be tied together better. The abstract focuses on IFs; the conclusion on screening. Both should focus on both.

2. I don't find Table 2 as informative as would be a similar but more discrete analysis of all findings by age (e.g., calculated in bins of 10 or 20 years [20-30 or 20-40 yrs]). The volume of available data should easily allow this. Judging from Table 1, were most findings in the older population?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Abstract (methods): "with their own costs" should be "at their own costs".
Illes et al. 2004 (Neurology) on IFs in adults is more relevant than the Kim et al. paper in AJNR. It should either be added to or replace the Kim reference.

Abstract (conclusion): Change "required" to present tense.

Discussion (para 1): Why are tumors singled out? AVMs?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.