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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have designed a retrospective study where they have deployed a software developed by the author AM in determining its utility in determining the positive rate of SLNB. I have a few suggestions/recommendations. Housekeeping rules: 1. Grammar needs to be edited. Perhaps use a professional app to help skim the manuscript. 2. Please number all lines to help making comments easy. Abstract: The results section need to be re-written with entire focus on significant relationships found on multivariate analysis. Univariate analysis in such a study do not hold any significance. It will help to generate the interest of the reader in the entire manuscript. Introduction: Utilization of SLNB in real world must be briefly discussed. Please review and add following manuscript PMID: 34109633 Results: I need clarification on this- The subtypes of melanoma were determined on dermoscopy and pictures or on the software imaging? Conclusion: I think that univariate results should be mentioned separately from those that were significant on multivariate analysis. The way the conclusion is written currently is misleading. Only eccentricity seems to be significant parameter in predicting SLNB positivity. It will be nice to add some figures of what kind of picture or output was visualized on the software. It will help understand the relevance of this manuscript to the reader.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors did a fascinating investigation to predict SLN+ positivity in melanoma by computer-aided image analysis. Previously, they extracted geometrical and color parameters based on this method. Although the data are limited, the results may provide a meaningful reference for image-based clinical disease diagnosis. This is a good paper, so I recommend acceptance following minor revisions.

1. Please briefly introduce the image processing algorithm used in this paper. Maybe a flow chart to show this algorithm would be ok.

2. Please show the real pictures of the lesions before and after image processing, which contribute to the results of these variables.

3. To improve this work, what does your team plan to study in the future?

4. Do you think combining physician experience (or traditional methods) and image processing to predict SLN+ positivity is a better research method?
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