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Reviewer's report:

General

This manuscript reported a study regarding a topic about to evaluate the accuracy of cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) image registration used in image-guided radiotherapy which can be interesting to some readers of this journal. However, this reviewer has some concerns about the study. Although the study is extensive and carefully conducted, I believe the study is not suitable for publication in the journal in its format. There is no inclusion and exclusion criteria. Moreover, how did the authors indicate the sample size. Power analysis? This section should be described further. In the introduction part, the literature review is somewhat brief, there are some other studies on the topic which authors would like to mention, please add more updated literature review here. This reviewer cannot able to catch the tumor size, since tumor since are not round/spherical and can be amorph shape as well. How did they calculate the dimension of the tumors? This issue should be clarified. The discussion also somewhat brief. The authors should use their results comparison with contemporary studies in the literature.

In consequence, I think the manuscript needs some minor revisions. The article will be accepted after the requested corrections completed.

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.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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