

Reviewer's report

Title: MDCT Findings of Denim-Sandblasting-Induced Silicosis

Version: 2 **Date:** 14 January 2010

Reviewer: Torben Sigsgaard

Reviewer's report:

This is a substantially improved paper on an important topic. However, there are still some points that have to be addressed.

Major issues

Latency period

It is not clear from the paper, what is meant by latency period.

This should be addressed in the methods as well as in the abstract.

The study population is a series of people, who have been recruited from the local area. It is not clear from the paper from where these cases are drawn is it a series of consecutive patients, or is this merely a study including all people who showed up at the hospital.

In the end of the discussion there is a short note on the differences from other types of silicosis, occurring after other types of exposure.

I would like to have this part extended to an in depth description of the unique findings associated to jeans sandblasting.

The abstract

MDCT should be spelled out first time used in the abstract

The conclusion

The wording of the conclusion should be changed, especially the last sentence has no meaning as it reads now.

Minor

There are still some typos that have to be eliminated.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.