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Reviewer's report:

In my view, both the abstract and methodology section should explicitly refer to the fact that the patients were treated in a time or place that did not use nodule cytology in pre-operative assessment as this is in marked contrast to contemporary practice. In addition, if the nodules were mostly detected during a routine medical examination, in asymptomatic patients, then this too must be explicitly stated in the methodology section. Presumably, the medical examination included a neck ultrasound as many of the nodules are less than 2cm and would not have been apparent on physical examination in most patients. This should be clearly stated in the text since the natural history of screen-detected nodules, as opposed to nodules detected by the patient, is not clearly known. If the nodule size is derived from ultrasound then this should be clearly stated in the text and table legends. Page 12, line 21: "increased risk for malignancy in the microcarcinomas" - the word "microcarcinomas" should be replaced with "nodules less than 1cm in diameter"
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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