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Reviewer’s report:

This study by Sormaala and colleagues is a well done and fluently written, although small methodological study on the diagnostic ability of 1.5T and 3T MRI to detect stress injuries at foot and ankle. The take-home-message is clear and obviously not novel, MRI is indispensable in detecting low-grade stress injuries. Whether 3T is better than 1.5T is not so clear to me - different performance was evident only in one case out of ten patients (10%) or two mild metatarsal injuries out of total 63 injuries (3%). Therefore I suggest that the authors are more cautious in their conclusions and rephrase them. Of course, 3T is becoming the clinical mainstay and therefore the present information, although tentative, is relevant.

Minor essential revisions:
The conclusion should be rephrased

Obviously it is not justified to calculate PPV as there were no false positive cases in this study. PPV is always 100% in this case.

How many disagreements there were between raters and consensus was required?

Page 7, para 2. Where is the statistical evidence that the STIR sequence at 3T was significantly better than at 1.5T? Statistical methods should be specifically described.

Discretionary revisions:
Title: Apparently the word “to” is missing (comparison to)
Text: Some typos (eg, endostela). Please check the text
Table 1. Please spell out the MRI abbreviations for non-specialists.
Supplementary table: Give the grades in Roman numbers as they are given in the text.
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
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