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Reviewer's report:

The authors have clearly taken the previous reviews on board and duly updated their manuscript. There are only a few minor problems that need to be fixed, most notably that the Accuracy formula is incorrect as noted in revision 5 below. Also, the discussion in particular should be edited again for grammar and coherence before final publication. A few examples are given in the revisions below.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Selection of Articles, paragraph 3 - make it "Studies were excluded to exclude the stability..."
2. Quality Assessment, paragraph 2 - make it "...using the quality assessment of diagnostic studies (QUADAS)..."
3. Quality Assessment, paragraph 4 - make it "Values for true-positive (TP), false-positive (FP), ..., ...(NLR) in the detection of ..."
4. Quality Assessment, paragraph 4 - spelling: radio -> ratio
5. Quality Assessment, paragraph 4 - Accuracy formula is wrong. Numerator should be (TP + TN).
6. Meta-Analysis, paragraph 1 - "...if the differences across the studies were greater than..."
7. Meta-Analysis, Publication-bias analysis - "...whereas a skewed and asymmetric..." This is redundant, use one or the other. Skewness is a measure of asymmetry.
8. Results, paragraph 4 - spelling: hmogeneity -> homogeneity
9. Results, paragraph 4 - make it "Therefore, notable heterogeneities..."
10. Discussion, paragraph 5 - confusing wording "...should be used in screening crowd to early detect nonpalpable lesions.." This sentence needs to be fixed.
11. Discussion, paragraph 7 - "The significant variance of threshold values..." This implies a statistically significant variance. Better to change to "substantial",...
or "large", or something similar.

12. Discussion, paragraph 7 - make it "For example, a relatively higher threshold value..."

13. Discussion, paragraph 7 - remove "out", "...to minimize missing malignance in screening breast cancers."

14. Discussion, paragraph 7 - Last sentence has a few grammar errors as well.

Discretionary Revisions
The Discussion section could be better organized to get the key points across better. I leave it up to the authors to pursue this.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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