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Reviewer's report:

The authors address the important topic of "what is underneath that shoulder strain diagnosis in ED?" This is a pilot study assessing the capacity of MRA to diagnose significant soft tissues injuries and alter traditional care.

Significant question/suggestion to be address by authors:

- The enrollment of the subject is consecutive, convenient. In the Methods section, the authors should detail the subject selection process. The authors mentioned that their EP treat about 600 soft tissue injuries to the shoulder. How was their cohort selected. How do they compared to the missed? If this pilot study only selected the sicker, the results may look "more significant".

- Please explain the rationale for the 2 weeks follow-up. Is this a standard of care. Most shoulder injuries we see at our institution will be f/up by a GP after ED discharge.

- The authors should define apriori the significance of the outcome. The actual main outcome is broad. Could "significant lesions" be described and categorized.

- Shoulder surgery is an important outcome in this study : how was the decision made? Was this a surgeon-based decision or a criteria based decision. If decision was based on well-defined criteria can the authors provide them.

- Table 2 should probably be transform in Figures. Difficult and heavy to read as it stands.

Minor corrections:

Page 3 line 3 remove a "."
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