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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

I would like to thank you for your effort in this study on suggesting a new method with promising result that can be applied in clinical practice. The hypothesis behind this study is scientific. I personally thank all of the contributors.

I have some comments, questions and recommendations about the study that raised in my mind.

1) Title should be simple and short.

2) Conclusion is so sharp. It has to be soften in the abstract section.

3) In the design of the analyses, you exclude 15 nodules out of 44. This causes a bit of bias for your analysis and for your conclusion. You should rather include these patients to your analysis or change the results sections like "For carefully selected group of patients…". This would be more suitable for daily practice of the physicians.

4) At the end of the results section (page 13, line12-17), you compared group 1 (n=24) and group 2 (n=5). Even though there is a significant difference, due to non-homogeneity and very low number in group 2, this conclusion is very weak to interpret. It is better to soften the conclusion and sentences about general frame of the study all over the manuscript (esp. it must be emphasized in the discussion and conclusion).

5) Does focal and total nodular ROI evaluation performed by the same physician (In another words, Rater 1[TN-ROI] = Rater 1[FN-ROI])?

6) I also agree that a multi-center prospective study would be better to highlight usefulness of this technique.

7) Decision is Major revision.
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 am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal