

01/12/2015

Response letter

Dear editor,

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript.

Please find our responses to the reviewers below:

Reviewer 1: It is a paper about radiation from diagnostic imaging I have the following suggestions: Please, would you compare the rates of ionizing x non-ionizing radiation? Table 1 and 2: please, include abbreviations at the end of the Tables.

Response: Thank you for your review and comments. An analysis of the rates of ionizing radiation use compared to non-ionizing radiation use has been included in the results section. Abbreviations have been added to all tables where necessary.

Reviewer 2: Title: The main title accurately reflects the major topic and content of the study. Abstract: The abstract present the advantages and significant points related to the background, objectives, materials and methods, results, and conclusions. Materials and Methods: The materials and methods sufficiently described for the results and conclusions. Results: The results provide sufficient data to draw firm scientific conclusions. Discussion: The conclusions are drawn appropriately supported by the literature. Overall : This is a prospective, interdisciplinary study conducted in the ICU of a large tertiary referral and level 1 trauma center. This is a valuable study. This report may be useful in keep radiation exposures from diagnostic imaging as low as reasonably practical and CED should be minimized where feasible, especially in young patients.

Response: Thank you for your review and comments. No changes requested by the reviewer.

Reviewer 3: The authors studied the CED from diagnostic imaging in ICU patients with good results. Some problems existed. 1. Use of abbreviations: When first using an abbreviation, the full phrase should be given. For example, cumulative effective radiation dose (CED). Later, you can always use the abbreviation CED without mentioning the full phrase. However, the authors did not abide by this rule all the time. In the text, the authors just used the abbreviations without mentioning the full phrases. Even if you had mentioned the abbreviations in the abstract, you should give the full phrases

in the text. A lot of abbreviaitons were not given the full phrases, for example, CT, ICU, ITU in DISCUSSION, MRI etc. Please give the full phrase the first time using them. Check the whole article and correct all similar problems. 2. References: In the forth paragraph in the DISCUSSION, the authors mentioned “similar to previous studies assessing CED-----”, here no references were given. Please give the references for the “previous studies. 3. Tables: In the tables, please give the full phrases of the abbreviations using a note below the table. 4. Figures: Please explain the abbreviations by giving the full phrases like “abdo, ct, xr, tap, ced” etc.

Response: Thank you for your review and comments. The use of abbreviations has been corrected in the abstract and main text. Abbreviations have also been added to the tables and figures as necessary. References have been added to support the statement ‘similar to previous studies assessing CED’ in the discussion section.

In addition, we have addressed all the issues highlighted in the main document including reformatting the references and the providing all files related to academic rules and norms.

All authors are native speakers of English.

All changes have been highlighted in yellow.

Please let me know if there are any additional requirements.

Thank you.

Dr Fiachra Moloney
FFR RCSI

fiachramoloney@hotmail.com