

Round 1

	Author response
In the abstract is written that 'The agreement between USG and MRI in the detection of fascial space infection was 100%. Ultrasonography showed 42 (84%) of 50 involved fascial spaces.' This is not correct as the agreement between both techniques is not 100% (as also already can be read in the second sentence).	As per valuable suggestions from reviewer, we have done the modification in the manuscript
Add to the results the PPV, NPV, sensitivity and specificity of both techniques.	As per the valuable suggestion of reviewer, we have added the sensitivity and specificity, PPV, NPV of both techniques in the manuscript
With regard to the mention of the figure in the results section. Do not describe what can be seen in the figures, but what is seen in the figures	As per the valuable suggestions from the reviewer, we have done the modification in the manuscript.
What is meant by stages of infection in table 2.	The table is modified according to the suggestion of the reviewer.
I am puzzled by figure 5. This is not a proper way to drain an abscess. Or is this figure just an illustration to collect pus for culturing?	With respect to reviewer comment. The figure illustrates the just the collection of pus for the culture. Accordingly, we have done modification in manuscript
(1) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant	As per the suggestion, we uploaded the grant application form in website

application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document.	
(2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;	As per the suggestion we have provided the original pictures in power point format
8) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.	As per editor suggestion, we have mentioned the articles highlights in the main text

Round 2

Dear Sir, With respect to reviewer's valuable suggestion, even we authors felt that resolution of the figure is not good and we don't have high resolution picture. Figure quality will not meet the criteria of the journal. So we have removed the figure 5, also mentioning about figure number in text. We have mentioned in text part regarding pus is collected for culture in determining microorganism. We request reviewer to We are uploaded the revised manuscript with this reply. kindly accept our modification. Thank you