

Dear editor,

We would like to thank you and the reviewers for providing us with constructive feedback about our article. We have worked to accommodate your recommendations and our course of action is presented below.

Best regards,

Marios Papadakis

Corresponding Author

Reviewer 1

"Grammar needs to be edited. Perhaps use a professional app to help skim the manuscript."
The manuscript underwent again proofreading from a different professional service.

"Please number all lines to help making comments easy."
This is an automatically generated file from the submission system of the journal.

"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. "
The manuscript has been accordingly revised. The univariate analysis has been removed.

"Introduction: Utilization of SLNB in real world must be briefly discussed. Please review and add following manuscript PMID: 34109633 "
The manuscript has been accordingly revised and the requested manuscript has been cited.

"Results: I need clarification on this- The subtypes of melanoma were determined on dermoscopy and pictures or on the software imaging?"
The subtypes were determined on dermoscopy and pictures.

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.
The manuscript has been accordingly revised.

"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."
Figures have been added, according to the reviewers' suggestion.

Reviewer 2

"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."

We thank the reviewer for his feedback.

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

The image processing algorithm and the flow chart have been added according to the reviewer's suggestion.

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

Figures have been added according to the reviewer's suggestion.

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

We plan to perform the study prospectively.

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

Indeed, the combination of physician experience (at least when assessing risk factors such as ulceration etc) and image processing can better predict SLN positivity. In case of doubt in image processing, we always recommend following the precautionary principle, i.e. assume SLN positivity.