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Reviewer's report:

General comment

The paper presents a review of studies about method of automated detection of nonmelanoma skin cancer using digital images. The authors defined the query and explored digital libraries with it. The methodology of studies analysis is well described. The review was registered in PROSPERO database and the PRISMA Checklist and flow diagram has been used and attached to the paper. However the description of review in PROSPERO database (Review Question and Primary outcome(s) fields) is inconsistent with paper. In PROSPERO database described analysis focuses on using Machine Learning method in automated detection of NMSC, but the topic includes "digital images". That inconsistency is visible in the article e.g. in proposed search string where main focus is on the machine learning methods. Many methods and synonyms were used for ML and only one word for image (why not photo, photograph, dermatoscopic…?). Please consider changing the title and/or please better justify the "image" in the contents.

Detailed remarks:

1) L 69-70 Why these database? I suggest add Google Scholar database and if you decide to explore the IEEE digital library why not search the Springer Link database ScienceDirect database (Elsevier)? Both publisher has journals with topic about skin cancer, image analysis and machine learning (in image analysis too).

2) L 205 Please explain why do you relate to number of mobile devices in the world. In previous sections there is no information about methods of obtaining digital images of skin pathologies (especially by the mobile devices in specific analyzed studies). So that sentence is confused.
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