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Reviewer's report:

The aims of the study are very significant and although data obtained are in contrast to the literature could be truly innovative and of interest.

However article is not well written and doesn't deep analyzed all obtained results, focusing only on some of them.

Moreover, there may be same limitation in sample examined (e.g. single institution, same ethnic group..) that have to be highlighted.

There are some missing data and repetitions in the Methods section (e.g. number of patients).

Did you performed a chest/abdominal RX to patients? In this case it could be of interest compare RX vs CT (although RX isn't gold standard, CT is time-consuming and not always available).

Finally it's necessary to amplify Introduction and Discussion sections.

Tables and figure are well structured.

I hope in your early re-submission of the article.

Thanks
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?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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