

Answers to Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer #1:

It is a good study. It can be accepted

Answer: Thanks for the positive review.

Reviewer #2:

I am pleased to be a reviewer of your manuscript. There is a formal comment. 1. Page 12, in the results, and Figure 4. Statistics is necessary such as p-value when comparing overall classification rates 2. Page 13, line 1~line 4, Statistics is necessary such as p-value between ROC curves, when comparing specificity, sensitivity, PPV and NPV.

Answer: We would have liked to add statistical tests to our results but the problem is that common statistical tests do not work for our experimental test setup because we compare results from different databases (with different distributions). Statistical tests are well suited to compare the outcomes from different automated diagnosis systems on a given database, but not to compare which databases (and hence which image modalities) are best suited for a given set of automated diagnosis systems.

Page 4, line 4 from top. Please check the sentence "The sensitivity and specificity rates of ~ that non-neoplastic lesions were classified more accurately in general than non-neoplastic lesions.". Thank you

Answer: We corrected that sentence: "Non-neoplastic lesions were classified more correctly in general than non-neoplastic lesions."