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Reviewer's report:

No major or minor revisions needed. Grammatical suggestions as below.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, the novel parameter of asphericity is examined as an independent predictor of outcome in NSCLC.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes. The study is retrospective using data that had already been acquired. This does not detract from the quality of the study.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes. The data seems to be significant and promising as a predictor of outcomes in patients with NSCLC.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes. I agree with them that one of the great limitations on this study is that it is from a single institution. I look forward to further papers on the topic of asphericity and its prognostic value.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes, previous papers on the topic of asphericity are referenced.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes.
There are a few corrections that may need to be made with respect to style and grammar.

Line 92. I believe that the authors intended to use the term "staging" rather than "stadium". If stadium is indeed the word that they would like to use, I would like some additional explanation.

Line 109. I believe that the word "ito" should be "to".

Line 180. I think that the equation is missing.

Line 186. The term "e.g." need not be used.

Line 210. The word "where" should be changed to "were".

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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