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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript reported a study regarding a topic about to explore the potential of Micro-optical coherence tomography (μOCT) as an intraoperative diagnostic imaging tool for identifying and discriminating glioma and meningioma thus may help neurosurgeons to perform precise surgery which can be interesting to some readers of this journal. However, this reviewer has some concerns about the study. There some issues that should be clarified and discussed by the authors.

1. Article Title

The title is inappropriate. However, titles should also emphasize the method of the study. The study is about evaluating QCT as well as comparison of pathology. Thus, I suggest authors indicate this in the title.

2. Abstract

Abstract is appropriate. However, there can be several suggestions for the "Methods" section. Please do not use abbreviations in the abstract section and follow the instructions for authors.

3. Introduction: Review of the Literature

The review of the literature is adequate and updated. However, several studies are available about dose optimization should also be inserted, the authors may wish to add those in this section.

4. Statement of Objectives

The objectives are clear.
5. Material and Methods
The methods are clear and detailed.

6. Statistical Analysis
There is no statistical analysis needed.

7. Results
The results are clear. The tables are also appropriate.

8. Discussion
The inferred results are well described.

9. Conclusions
This reviewer agrees with the conclusion drawn in the study.

10. Figures
Appropriate.

11. References
The references are generally good, there are some minor errors which can be corrected.

12. Grammar and Style
Recommend the manuscript be reviewed for spelling, punctuation and grammar. There are few mistakes in the reference list which should be corrected. is in need of further refinement.
This manuscript reported a study regarding a topic about to explore the potential of Micro-optical coherence tomography (µOCT) as an intraoperative diagnostic imaging tool for identifying and discriminating glioma and meningioma thus may help neurosurgeons to perform precise surgery which can be interesting to some readers of this journal. However, this reviewer has some concerns about the study. There some issues that should be clarified and discussed by the authors.

**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.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Acceptable
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