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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your revisions. There are only a few minor further changes required in response to your revisions.

page 2: line 37: Please add "outcomes" to the revised text i.e. "Primary safety and feasibility (of surgical staging) outcomes..."

page 9: line 211: add ";" before "estimates will be provided..."

page 13: line 295: correct spelling of "assess" (currently "asses")

page 13: line 303: the word "result" does not need to be added; instead please just remove "and allocation concealment" from this sentence

Progression to phase 3 trial: Thank you for providing an explanation of the considerations that will be required when deciding whether or not this trial should progress to Phase 3. Please could you add the information in your reply to the discussion section i.e "The final decision whether or not a phase 3 trial is deemed safe and necessary is a decision that should be made by a group of experts. This decision should take into account the difference between current standard of care and surgical staging on subjective (quality of life) and objective (time of treatment delay, blood loss, adverse events, etc.) outcome measures, while controlling for confounders and selection bias due to the randomization. In addition, data on both sensitivity and specificity should also be considered. Although this study only includes 15 patients, it is almost a doubling of the currently available number of patients in whom PET-CT was compared to gold standard histology (n=16)."
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