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Author's response to reviews:

To
The Editor
BMC Medical Imaging.

Sir,

We would like to submit the revised version of the article titled "The Swimmer’s view - Does it really show what it is supposed to show? A retrospective study." The points raised by the reviewers have been addressed in the revised version. These are mentioned below:

Reviewer 1.

1. There were no cervical spine injuries which were missed on the Swimmer’s view and were picked up by CT scan / MRI. This has been mentioned in the results section.
2. I agree with the reviewer that cervical spine injuries may be missed on CT / MRI, and the literature evidence on missed cervical spine injuries on CT scans has been included in the manuscript. I could not find any evidence on missed cervical spine injuries on MRI and therefore have not incorporated this in the manuscript.
3. With regards to the availability of CT & MRI scanning facilities, all centres accepting trauma patients will have these facilities and as these modalities will be used when plain radiographs are inadequate there is no question of increasing the waiting times.
4. The fact that the sensitivity & specificity of a CT or MRI increases with a high index of clinical suspicion has been included in the manuscript.

Reviewer 2.

1. The results & discussion sections have been separated in the manuscript. Although the results section appears to be short it contains all the relevant findings of the study. The discussion section has been lengthened.
2. A table with the results of the study has been included in the manuscript and
centages have been included within the text.

3. This study is an assessment of adequacy of Swimmer’s views, no patients were assessed. All the radiographs were done in trauma patients and the Swimmer’s views were done as the initial assessment if the lateral cervical spine radiographs were inadequate as per ATLS guidelines. The number of patients with concomitant injuries has been mentioned.

4. The inclusion and exclusion criteria have been included in the manuscript and the word ‘randomly’ has been removed.

5. In the discussion section the imaging in obtunded patients has been included. The use of Swimmer’s views in alert patients has already been discussed in the manuscript.

6. The words ‘gold standard’ has been removed from the manuscript and the reference for Swimmer’s view being the preferred additional view has been added.

We thank the reviewers for their suggestions. The manuscript reads well after revision. Please consider the manuscript for publication.

Thanking you,
Yours truly,
Mr Ulfin Rethnam