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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript is very well written and interesting. It more, or less investigates an area that few other studies have done in the past, nevertheless it surely adds in our knowledge about the FDG glycolytic phenotype of lung carcinoid tumors on PET/CT.

Major Compulsory Revisions:
In table 1, the patients should not be listed with their initials (for confidentiality purposes).

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. In the Abstract’s “Conclusions” is mentioned that: “Our study showed that FDG-PET/CT might be a useful tool in the evaluation of SPNs bronchial carcinoids.” I think that it was meant to be written: “….. tool in the evaluation of SPNs suspected to be bronchial carcinoids.”. Otherwise, it doesn’t make sense, since surgery follows.
2. In the “background”: “Conversely, recent studies have found an higher sensitivity of FDG-PET…….” It should be “…a higher sensitivity…..”
3. In the “Methods” on the 2nd paragraph: “In cases of positive bronchoscopy, an endoscopic biopsy of the lesion was undertaken.” The meaning is not quite clear.

Discretionary Revisions:
1. In the “Methods”, under “FDG PET/CT”: “SUVmax is the maximum measured activity at the region of interest (ROI), which is normalized for body weight/surface area and injected dose.” Since the actual definition of SUVmax is much more “complicated” it would be rather better not to use this one, or try to rephrase it.
2. In the “Methods”, under “FDG PET/CT”: “…..the tumor size was defined by the longest diameter.” Minor, but this is a potential weakness in the design since the partial volume effect is mostly affected by the shortest diameter.
3. A little more correlation of variables were done (than maybe necessary), but nicely and in a simple way presented.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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