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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript describes the implementation of a curricular high standard ultrasound course during the undergraduate medical education. Aim of the study was the evaluation of the course acceptance by the 4th year medical students. Subjective measurements like a pre- and post-questionnaire using the Likert scale and the EVALUNA evaluation tool were used. Objective evaluation was carried out by DOPS. The self-assessments showed a significant increase in knowledge and confidence, the EVALUNA showed the course acceptance and there was an expected task completion in the DOPS (9 from 12 points).

In general, the paper is well-written. The title and abstract clearly described the study, reasons for the study, method of the study, and results of the study very clearly and concisely. The methods as outlined are informative if one wished to replicate of the study. The results were clearly stated and the discussion is mostly clear.

However, the study design is not very strong. The question is why should one expect a course nonacceptance from undergraduate students? Anything but an increase in knowledge and competence should be very surprising.

The authors should correct their background information “ultrasound…has not been systematically implemented as a curricular course in undergraduate medical teaching”. We have implemented a DEGUM-course in musculoskeletal ultrasound in the 2nd year undergraduate medical education using trained student-teachers with the same positive feedback (Knobe et al. 2012 BMC Medical Education).

This study is novel in that it examines the effect of teaching in ultrasound technique by DOPS. This should be put forward and I miss information of the development process of items and criteria. The detailed process of the DOPS exam is not clear.

Specific comments:

Were there 8 or 9 different practice items in DOPS?

Figure 1 makes no contribution to the content of the study and should be deleted

The phrase “new teaching method” should be replaced
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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