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REVIEWER’S REPORT

Dear Authors,

I appreciate your thorough attention to all comments and critique. I still believe the paper would greatly benefit if the total number of patients submitted to plain X-ray during the 3 years period, having suspected retention of foreign body and among whom the study population (47 patients) was selected, is included. If this is not possible, in Methods section should be reported if the study group submitted to US represents all cases having X-ray negative, or only a randomized part (which percentage?).

This is the main point that still requires clarification. However, I suggest other minor essential and discretionary revisions to improve the readability of manuscript:

Background

6th paragraph should be located in Methods section, included in the 3rd paragraph.

Results

1st paragraph: I think that sensitivity and specificity should be calculated on foreign bodies really identified on surgery. In fact, the Authors have no confirmation of presence and type of foreign body in 8 patients who didn’t undergo to surgery.

On the other hand, the description of surgery removal and the definite identification of foreign body (8th, 5th and 9th paragraph) should be located soon after the 1st paragraph.

5th paragraph: Authors describe 45 objects revealed by surgery (21+6+18), but then they report 45 patients with 50 objects. At 8th paragraph they report 39 f.b. surgically removed.

According to Abstract, I have understood that surgery was performed in 39 patients (in fact 6+2=8 decided to choose regular follow-up instead of surgical removal). Well, 44 f.b. were removed and identified. If so, their number and type should be revised and controlled on all Results and Discussion sections, in Table 1 and added in Abstract, Results section: “Surgery was performed in 39 patients and 44 foreign bodies were removed in all”.
Grammar corrections:

Background
5th paragraph: 100%, 95% respectively > 100% and 95%, respectively

Methods
1st paragraph: Frothy>forthly
3rd paragraph: esaoe my lab>Esaote MyLab
5th paragraph: singe>sign
6th paragraph: writhen>written

Results
6th paragraph: Figure>Figures
7th paragraph: Figure4>Figure 4
10th paragraph: singe>sign
11th paragraph: singe>sign (repeated twice)

Discussion
5th paragraph: Size>size
6th paragraph: intermascular> intermuscular
fascia and etc.>fascia etc.
inter muscular> intermuscular
they hav> they have
9th paragraph: choronicity> chronicity
13th paragraph: singe>sign

Thanks for the opportunity!
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Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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