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Reviewer's report:

Dear Author,

This is an interesting study with valuable information. However, there are some points to be explained or corrected.

1. In the "methods" section, (line 99-101) it was written that CT-guided percutaneous marking was used in the first period of the study, and bronchoscopic marking in the following period. This is not clear. You should explain by which criteria you have switched from one technique to the other. In the line 195-196 it was written that "the choice of percutaneous marking or bronchoscopic marking depends on the localisation of the tumor and the number of markers to be injected". Is this a preference criteria in your study or a reference (if reference, this sentence necessitate a reference). If it is a selection criteria between both technique in your study, this is confusing, because according to table 1 there is no difference in the depth of the lesion between both methods.

2. There are mismatching between the picture and legends of figure 2, figure 3 and figure 4. I think there happened an error in uploading process.

3. The author mentioned that (line 138) "the surgical procedure was performed one day after the bronchoscopic marking". So, the author should also mention when they performed surgery following CT-guided marking, immediately after the procedure or not?

4. The sentences in lines 187-190, lines 195-196, lines 208-210, and lines 226-230 necessitate reference numbers (if they are not personal opinions).

5. There is an error in Table 2. Pneumothorax rate in the bronchoscopic injection group was given as 0/22, but 20%. Is this correct? (it should be 0%).
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