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Reviewer's report:

It was a pleasure to review your manuscript.

I have some comments to the authors:

1) Abstract: The key question of the authors has been whether ultrasound scan can show comparable results to traditional MRI-scan or CT-scan (please see the abstract). However, the authors have only reported results from different studies reporting specificity, sensitivity and NPV and PPV of ultrasound scan. Further in the conclusion of abstract is stated that "Ultrasonography demonstrates good diagnostic accuracy,". Please define good (%) and accuracy. I have tried to find these definitions in the manuscript body without success.

2) The authors have registered their systematic review which is very well done. The authors have followed the PRISMA guideline which pretty much appreciated. However, the search string and key words and combination of keywords used in different search engines are not defined. I was for example unable to check the numbers given in the PRISMA flow chart.

3) Method: The method section starts with objectives. Objectives belong to Introduction not the Method part. Eligibility criteria and inclusion and exclusion criteria are well defined in the table excessive words are unnecessary.

4) Results: Too many subheadings makes it very difficult and makes the article awkward. I had difficulties to understand were the results are started. Please make clear definitions of each section. There You have presented your results in a table excessive words are unnecessary.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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