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Reviewer's report:

PAGE 2; LINE 27: It is also important when you need to decide if it is an N1 or N2 (10R vs 4R) because it will change the treatment the patient will receive.

PAGE 4; LINE 75: of.

PAGE 4; LINE 76: I think it will be as crucial for "hit and run" as for the systematic mapping. It is very important to correctly classify lymph node station as N1-N2 or N3, because directly affects the type of treatment the patient will receive.

PAGE 7; LINE 152: were.

PAGE 7; LINE 152: You mean areas marked by more than 20% of the 14 experts: 2,8 physicians? This sentence is not very clear to me.
PAGE 8; LINE 168: Did you give any advice to the physicians about how big the area should be?

PAGE 9; LINE 210: I think the main added value would be to help the less experiment physicians to locate the lymph node stations and may be it would help to reduce the duration of the procedure. But It is true that usually the intrabronchial image is not the main tool you use to define a nodal station.

PAGE 11; LINE 240: Perhaps the pretracheal boundary between 4R and 10R once the azygos vein arrives into the inferior vena cava is not entirely clear.

It also possible than the EBUS bronchoscope is not flexible enough to be introduced into the right upper lobe bronch to examine properly 10R.

CONCLUSIONS: I think this study can help to the new physicians to improve the learning curve in EBUS and the duration of the procedure as the landmarks can guide properly the study of the vascular margins.

A better definition for what is the left border of the trachea is needed to be able to validate 4R postion.

It is important to pursue the validation of the 4R-10R limits: endobronchial and vascular as they may not always be clear as it is shown in this paper, even to expert physicians.
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