Peer Review File

Article information: http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gs-20-543.

Reviewer #1

This interesting paper focus on dual energy CT application in different gland tumors. References are well up to date. Good imaging quality.

Comment 1: a comprehensive revision of the English used is needed (word-for-word translation is often observed within the text; moreover, in some sentences, the subject/ verb is missing)

A revision of the grammatical/English language was provided by a mother-tongue teacher.

Comment 2: Line 83, page 4, between brackets: no advantages derived by citing the specific CT scanner used in a study

Similarly, lines 121-122, page 5; line 143 page 6; line 152 page 6; line 180 page 7; lines 199-200 page 8; lines 206-207 page 9; line 212 page 9; line 231 page 10; line 245 page 10; line 268 page 11; lines273-274 page 11; line 284 page 12; line 292 page 12; line 301 page 12; line 317 page 13; line 349 page 14;

The authors agree with the Reviewer; all specific CT scanner used were deleted from the text.

Comment 3: In this regard, detailed descriptions of the cited studies are too often observed; although methods and results should be important for supporting a specific concept, proposing repeatedly long descriptions of each individual study ends up losing the thread of reading. Generally, it is advisable to provide the key result of a study in order to support the proposed thesis, avoiding when possible too long and detailed descriptions devoid of practical meaning to the purpose of the text.

The authors agree with the Reviewer; all specific detailed descriptions were deleted from the text.

Comment 4: when citing a study it is always better to put only the surname of the first author followed by et al, without including the initial of the name (some example: line 316; line 348; line 299; line 291; line 266; line 243; line 228; etc)

The authors agree with the Reviewer; all cited studies were corrected.

Comment 5: Fig 3 caption: the use of the third person should always be preferred

(avoid colloquial forms such as "you can see")
The authors agree with the Reviewer; figure caption was corrected.

To conclude: the manuscript should be carefully reviewed. Notably, authors should review the English and try to make more fluent the logic of the text. In my opinion, the text denotes the excellent work of the authors to show the correct application of dual energy advantage in the study of glandular tumors.

Reviewer #2

The paper reviews the main applications and advantages of Dual Energy CT in the evaluation of endocrine and exocrine tumors. The paper is well written, readable and exhaustive. Two recommendations for the authors:

Comment 1: Please double check for minor typing errors or minor grammatical errors;
A revision of the grammatical/English language was provided by a mother-tongue teacher.

Comment 2: The acronym nMERA is confusing and not in common use. The cited reference 119 (Okada K et al. Jpn J Radiol, 2020; 38:154-164) defines the acronym of nMERA for "New MonoEnergetic Reconstruction Algorithm" (with the noise reduction at low keV) to compare this algorithm with the standard reconstruction algorithm (sMERA) for monochromatic images (without noise correction), both by Siemens Healthineers. The authors of the paper in reference 119 use the acronym sMERA when indicating the Monoenergetic Plus algorithm (Mono+, Siemens Healthineers) firstly described in the paper of Grant et al (the reference No. 17 in the paper of Okada et al. Grant KL, Flohr TG, Krauss B, Sedlmair M, Thomas C, Schmidt B. Assessment of an advanced image-based technique to calculate virtual monoenergetic computed tomographic images from a dual-energy examination to improve contrast-to-noise ratio in examinations using iodinated contrast media. Invest Radiol. 2014;49(9):586-92). The reference 119 (Okada et al is correct); please clarify or at least change the term nMERA with Monoenergetic Plus or Mono+.

The authors agree with the Reviewer; nMERA was substituted with Monoenergetic Plus.