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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Background, 2nd paragraph. I don’t agree images eliminate inaccuracies from variation in descriptive ability. Some important issues, as weight, sizes, consistency of tumours are not in images. Some tumours can’t be seen, but can be felt and touched.

Background, 3rd paragraph. ...images can eventually replace word description of macroscopic specimens with the potential to replace them completely. Same as 2nd paragraph. I don’t agree.

Methods, 1st paragraph. The 23 question survey was not shown. It is important to know the questions and possible answers to them.

Methods, 2nd paragraph. Why was the survey distributed to current employees known to be involved in digital pathology practices? It can be a bias, as the respondents are more familiar with the topic and do not represent the country. At last line, the authors say that 100 people were sent the link to the survey. Do the authors know how many pathologists and path residents are there in Canada? 100 people can represent what % of Canadian pathologists?

Results, 1st paragraph. Do the authors know from how many institutions the 60 respondents come? Is there more than one respondent per institution or lab? Figure one is incomplete. The proportion of pathologists with 6-10 years of practice is not shown in the graphic.

Conclusions. The authors called discussion topic as conclusion. The conclusions should come in the end, clearly and objective.

Conclusions, 2nd paragraph. ...Image files can be quiet large... Image files of scanned slides are large, but gross pictures are not so large. It appears again at 4th paragraph. ...cost association of gross photography...This must include larger files as digital microscopy and system programs. Only gross photography files are not so large and equipments are relatively cheap (any phone mobile has a camera). I felt that sometimes the authors make some confusion about gross photography and digital pathology. The authors should correct this sentence including all topics of digital pathology.
Minor Essential Revisions

Background is too long. I would suggest being more objective, with smaller paragraphs.

Background 5th paragraph. The focus here changed to digital microscopy and glass slides.

The questions of the study are well defined in the abstract, but are not so clear in the manuscript.

Methods, 2nd paragraph. ...Emails contained an invitation to participate.... The authors repeat the sentence they wrote in the end of 1st paragraph.

Results 1st paragraph. The authors divided the results in two portions, which was not specified in methods and, in my opinion, were not necessary.

Results, 1st paragraph. The authors repeat a sentence...Another large majority of respondents use digital.....institution (90%).
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