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Reviewer’s report:

Changes in CT morphology can be an independent response marker for patients receiving regorafenib for colorectal liver metastases: retrospective study

This article reports on a very limited retrospective study to assess one morphologic CT parameters and its correlation with survival compared to therapy response. The results are extremely limited as the chance for bias is huge in a cohort of only 10 patients which have heterogeneous prior treatment. All results are speculative and have a huge potential to be biased, therefore it is doubtful that any real conclusions can be drawn from this study. Can the authors expand the cohort by including a larger time window or contacting other institutes? This would make this study much more compelling and valuable.

Main issues are:

- This is a very limited study of only 10 patients. The title should be modified to include: retrospective pilot study.

- The description of the CT morphologic assessment is rather vague. I strongly suggest to expand the description with a direct link with figures representing each of the three groups.

- How are the morphologic groups assessed, by one radiologists? A panel of radiologists, what is the variability among radiologists scoring patients?

- It is unclear how there are three groups defined, but in the results only two groups are reported. Was one of the groups not present in the group of 10 patients?

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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