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Reviewer’s report:

Can you give more detail on the criteria for choosing to repeat the radial ultrasound rather than go for eg FNA? The nodules in your US series were large (averaging around 3 cm in diam). You have previously shown that lesions less than 2 cm diameter have a lower yield from radial ultrasound. Did you choose to repeat the US in larger nodules (what was the mean size of the lesions which went for an FNA as the second procedure). If you did, this needs highlighting in the discussion as it may explain your high yields.

Minor point - the statement that radial ultrasound is the investigation of choice for pulmonary nodules is still very debatable. Many centres still go for CT-guided FNA as the first step.

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.

No

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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