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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Professor Marcus Carlsson,

We appreciate the effort by you and the reviewers. The thorough and detailed reviews have been of great value in improving the manuscript. We have responded to the comments on a point by point basis below. We hope that you now will find our manuscript suitable for publication in BMC Medical Imaging.

Sincerely,

Yi-Hua Zhang Division of Medical Imaging and Technology
Department of Clinical Science, Intervention and Technology
Karolinska University Hospital, Huddinge,
141 86 Stockholm Sweden
Phone: +46 73 949 48 84,
Fax: +46 8 711 48 40
Sophia Zackrisson (Reviewer 1): 

Abstract:

There is no aim or purpose stated in the abstract. Perhaps amend the last sentence in the background: "Development in CT technique and image analysis has made CT volumetry less cumbersome. The aim of this study was to assess esophageal tumor volume by semi-automatic measurements as compared to manual."

We have revised the abstract according to the suggestion.

Materials

Thanks for providing more detailed information about the patient population. Could you just also add information about how many of the patients included at you center for the that were eligible for this specific study out of all that were imaged during the time period for the randomized trial. 23 out of xx?

We have added information about the total number of patients included in the randomized trial.

Results

Much improved presentation of results. Some details in the last part of the results do not seem correct. "The average absolute percentage difference from mean tumor volume was significantly lower when using semiautomatic segmentation (14 %, CI:9%-19%) than when using manual segmentation (32 %, CI: 26%-37%, p < 0.001, Figure 2). " I think it should be figure 3 that is referred and I also wonder if 32% is correct, In the figure it looks like 24%. Please check.

The reference to the figure has been corrected to figure 3 and the figure has been replaced with the correct one as the data for the previous figure was incorrect.
Discussion: the first sentence summarizing the results, line 11-13. I think it needs to be clearly stated that the semiautomatic segmentation is compared to manual measurements. Now it is not clear what is meant. I think that this should be clearly stated also in the conclusion (abstract and discussion).

The comparison to manual measurements has been more clearly stated in the discussion and conclusion.

The following sentence is found twice in the discussion:

"Those small differences in texture might aid the experienced radiologist". Please check if correct or try to use different wording.

The sentence has been revised to decrease repetition.