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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential revisions

A. INTRODUCTION
1. Too long, consider deleting or transferring paragraphs to the discussion section.

B. METHODS:
1. The authors should describe more clearly their patient population, inclusion and exclusion criteria.
2. Could you describe how the 3 hours interval was decided? Report your criteria.
3. It would be nice to document the selection criteria for CT scan used in this population - do they follow any particular decision rules?
4. What constitutes a positive CT scan?

C. RESULTS:
1. If the authors wish to include the information about clinical findings then these should be listed - perhaps as secondary outcome data.

DISCUSSION:
1. Unden has written a review article that includes the data from Biberthaler (the primary research)
2. Issues should be raised and discussed about timings from injury to sampling / admission to sample in the discussion and limitations sections

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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