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Reviewer's report:

-If the comparison is done between the imaging features of AML and RCC. Wouldn't you want to include that in the title of the submission? For example The independent indicators for differentiating renal cell carcinoma from renal angiomyolipomas by contrast-enhanced ultrasound?

-Line 17 of the abstract: Conclusions is misspelt.

-Line 6 of the introduction: Imaging is the main "differentiating" method is better than differential diagnosis method.

-66% of the RCCs were hypoechoic which makes echogenicity a predictor of RCC in CUS, therefore "it has limited use when attempting to differentiate between RCC and AML" is inaccurate in line 11 and 12 of page 2.

-Line 12 of page 8, you mention that Therefore, further imaging studies are needed for patients with uncharacteristic renal tumors. You noted the overlap in imaging features retrograde when comparing them to the pathology, so I think that the wording isn't really accurate. You better say, due to overlap in imaging features between some cases of AML and RCC, additional imaging to further characterize renal lesions is recommended.

-Line 4 of page 9, regarded not regard.

-Line 10, 14 and 18 of page 9 , change were fast wash out to showed/exhibited fast wash out.

-In your study, 56% of the RCCs showed fast wash out and for clear cell RCCs, the percentage is 47.5%. I know you mentioned the 56% was due to the majority of cases being of the chromophobe type, but I wouldn't generalize that fast wash out is a strong predictor for RCC, especially that clear cell RCC is the most common subtype of RCC.

-Line 7 and 8 of page 10, change was to showed
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