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Reviewer’s report:

MBGE-D-16-00520 Comparison of multiphase CT and CE MRI in the differential diagnosis of focal nodular hyperplasia. Excellent study needing minor revision. Clarity can be improved in places, specifically:

Abstract, methods: For clarity, please present here as 157 patients with equivocal FLLs detected in US who were subsequently examined by mpCT and ceMRI.

Results, p5 line 24: more detail needed here, such as "Table 1 lists all clinical symptoms for nonFNH and FNH that lead to initial US examination in those examined by MRI as well as CT."

P5, line 25: Unclear! According to Table 3 there were 35 patients with HCC rather than 38. Were there 3 liver cirrhosis patients without HCC (seems low)? Please specify the pathology in those 3 patients.

P6, line 3: change to: "FNH and non-FNH patient characteristics are listed in Table 2." Heading of Table 1: replace "The cause .." by "The indication for performing US in patients examined by CT and MRI (n=157)." Table 2, men to women ratio 1:1.19 and 1:3.88: Please list as male/female 54/64 and 8/31.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

'I declare that I have no competing interests'

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license ([http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal