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Reviewer's report:

general comments:

Throughout the work you refer to "routine" x-rays. This would tend to give the reader an impression that there is in fact some sort of x-ray that is routine. There is no such thing. Each x-ray should be justified. I think the work needs to be rewritten particularly the background/introduction of the paper and the abstract to indicate that the evidence-based guidelines strongly opposed the idea of a routine x-ray. Those that are carrying out routine, are not following the guidelines. If the paper is rewritten from this perspective it will be more evidence based and will have a stronger message. The message is that the guidelines say every x-ray should be justified, the clinicians feel that they do not need daily x-rays, so why are they being done.

Also, after work to several grammatical and typographical errors. Please proof read the work completely before resubmitting.

Title: overly long, consider shortening. Shorter titles receive more citations.

Abstract: Again, highlight the fact that all x-ray should be justified, and there is no such thing as a "routine" x-ray. In your methods indicate the number of respondents, Not just the percentages.

Background

You refer to a debate being ongoing. Where is this debate? If it is in the literature please use some references. From my perspective there is no debate, all x-rays need to be justified, otherwise the radiologist in charge is not following the basic safety standards.

There are strong reasons against the use of daily x-rays (routine) I think you make strong cases against them.
Method

Please indicate any attempts to validate the data. For example, 98% of participants indicated that the carried out routine radiographs. Did you check this against the picture archiving and communication system? Is it true?

Is a questionnaire it away to find out how many x-rays are being carried out? Surely an audit of the picture archiving and communication system would be a better way of doing this.

Discussion

Some part of the discussion or just a repeat of the results section and do not "discuss" the work. It would be good to see some indication of the radiation dose saving that might accrue should protocol be changed from daily, to on demand.

It would be good to see some quotes from the International Atomic Energy Association, basic safety standards and from valuable resources such as radiation protection 118 from the European Commission, making the best use of your department of clinical radiology from the Royal College of Radiologists, the National Institute of Clinical Excellence guidelines, and the imaging pathways of the government of Western Australia. All of these give clear indications as to when an x-ray is necessary, and when it is not. Your discussion does little to examine these resources or the evidence base.

Conclusion

the conclusion is overly long, please shorten it and size up your overall findings.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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