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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Little changes were advocated

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   There should be said that Korea is a country with out a Jodine deficiency. Therefore there are many Thyroids with only one nodule and so the excellent Ultrasound findings are possible.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes

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

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes

What next?

--------

Based on your assessment of the validity of the manuscript, what do you advise should be the next step?
- Accept without revision
- Accept after discretionary revisions (which the authors can choose to ignore)

- Accept after minor essential revisions (which the authors can be trusted to make)
  yes

- Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
- Reject because scientifically unsound
- Reject because too small an advance to publish (note that BMC Cancer will publish all sound studies including sound negative studies)