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Reviewer’s report:

I would like to thank the authors for presenting this interesting case. In my opinion there is scope to publish this article. However the focus of this article should be placed on how this error occurred and how this will be prevented in the future.

1. The quality of syntax and wording needs significant improvement. There are wording and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. In my opinion this article should NOT be accepted for publication until significant improvement is achieved in the language of the article. I would suggest that the author have this article proof read by a native english language speaker prior to re-submitting.

2. In the background section 1000-1500 operation --> per year? in the world? give more specific quantification please

3. Please change the term "Gauze" for "Surgical Swap" and also provide detail on the size of the swab

4. Most importanatly the authors need to give significantly more detail as of how this event changed their institutional practice of counts? Do they use WHO checklist and do they do instrument counts before chest closure routinely?

5. This event had a significant impact on the health of this patient. Was this incident discussed at the morbidity and mortality meeting in your institution? Did the authors approach the original team who did the cardiac surgery and inform them of this error? How did this event changed their practice. This needs to be detailed in the manuscript.

Few such cases have been reported in the literature. Hence per se this not an original report. However many manuscripts have not detailed how this incident made their practice of surgery safer so that such incidents "never events" never happen again. As such this manuscript will require substantial revision.

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of limited interest

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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