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Reviewer's report:

- Minor Essential Revisions

1) Materials and methods, paragraph "Radiological classification of adrenal lesions" - How was "stationary" defined? Which difference in size was considered to be within the error of measurement?

2) Materials and methods, paragraph "Radiological classification of adrenal lesions" - How long after contrast injection was the late series for absolute wash-out measurements obtained?

3) Results figure 1 – Are the groups with incomplete testing at baseline and incomplete testing at follow-up mutually exclusive?

4) Last paragraph of the results section and figure 2 – numbers of patients don’t match. Please revise.

5) Last paragraph of the results section and figure 1 – That only 63 out of 194 patients had complete work-up at baseline and follow-up is a weakness of the study, this is mentioned in the discussion. It may also illustrate what happens when clinical guidelines are translated into clinical practice. However, from figure 1 it seems that 113 patients (63+50) had complete work-up at 24 months. If these work-ups were all normal it would strengthen the authors’ case and it should be mentioned in the results section and discussed.

- Discretionary Revisions

6) Table 1 two last rows - Mean attenuation and mean wash-out is of limited interest. The table would be more informative if lesions were grouped according to the radiological classification in the methods section: Lipid rich (< 10 HU at unenhanced images), lipid poor with abs wash-out > 50 %, stationary et. c.

7) Last paragraph of the results section - More than one third of patients (21 out of 60) with a complete normal hormonal screening at 24 months follow-up had an initial abnormal (false-positive) biochemical screening. Which abnormalities were seen at baseline testing in this group?
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