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Reviewer's report:

This is a retrospective study. The author described the clinical presentation of 28 patients over 8 years period with diagnosis of inguinal abcess and the workflow of clinical management of these patient. All patients had a cross sectional imaging study either CT or MRI.

1. The topic is relevant but lack of focus into actual interest. From the objective and the result, I suggest the topic to be changed to a more focus area.

2. The methods needs to be more specified on how the patient was chosen eg at random or are there any specific characteristics eg presented to emergency department of ....hospital with abdominal pain or fever > 40 degrees etc. What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria from the actual number of the whole number of subjects.

3. The criteria of intra and extrapelvic abcesses were not detailed in the methodology on how the separation was made to stratify the patients.

4. It would be interesting if the author include at least 2 cross sectional images illustrating the difference between intra and extra pelvic origin of the abcesses. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

5. Otherwise these are sound data and the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition.

6. The discussion should also focus on the reason why there is a delay in the diagnosis and interventional treatment and wether this delay has potential impact on the outcome of the patient.

7. The conclusion is a bit long and doesn't reflect the topic and weakly supported by issue in the discussion

8. Nevertheless the author stated the limitations and acknowledge the previous

9. Overall writing is acceptable but the referrence material need to be at least 28-30 and to include the role of imaging in this area.

10. Please refer to additional comment on attached file

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.

Declaration of competing interests:
No