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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well written and strongly designed study to evaluate the accuracy of CT and MRI in the diagnosis of FNH.

1. Although the study is strongly designed with good sample size, the role of CT and MRI especially the hepatobiliary contrast is now well established through multiple studies in the recent past.

2. Pg3 Ln14 - "in about 30% of cases due to atypical radiological features [4, 5]." I feel this is an overstatement in the era of MRI. 30% should be more of CT data than MRI. MRI has great accuracy in FNH diagnosis

3. Did you encounter any problems with suboptimal hepatobiliary phase (not because of artifacts) due to liver dysfunction??

4. It is fairly well known that MRI outperforms CT in the diagnosis of focal lesions atleast practically. So with the addition of hepatobiliary contrast (an additional diagnostic parameter), naturally it is going to overshadow CT. Authors could have evaluated the role of Gd-BOPTA like its additional value in the diagnosis.

5. In and out phase was performed?? Any fat containing FNH?

6. What do you mean 'absence of enhancement in PV phase- What about wash-out??

7. Did you encounter pseudo-washout with Gd-BOPTA

8. Inflammatory hepatic adenoma is a hot topic now and mimics FNH. In your large sample size, any of FNH turned out to be adenoma on histopathology?

9. Table 5 and 6 - Lot of repeat of the information in the text. Either keep the text or table

10. Images are not adequate. More representative images of HBP appearance of FNH could be added.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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