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Reviewer’s report:

General
A well written and interesting paper, addressing an issue of great clinical impact.

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

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

I have only very minor comments

1) the Authors should report in the manuscript the references n° 3 (ICRP 1990) and n° 5 (Picano E, BMJ 2004)

2) In the “informed consent:how it should be” (page 7 )the Authors proposed and discussed a graph underlining the linear relation between dose and risk, but it has not been associated to the manuscript. Moreover, the graph should be indicated as Figure 3

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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