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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Authors,

thank you for the thorough revision of your manuscript, which now has been much improved. I only have some minor comments, listed below.

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."

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 your center for the specific study out of all that were imaged during the time period for the randomized trial. 23 out of xx?

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.

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 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.

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.

Unable to assess

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 am able to assess the statistics

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