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COVER LETTER
Submission of revised manuscript:
“Feasibility and accuracy of point-of-care pocket-size ultrasonography performed by medical students”

We hereby resubmit this original and revised manuscript version 3, in hope of it being of interest to the BMC Medical Education. We would also like to once again thank the reviewers for their valuable input and suggestions, which has contributed to the improvement of our manuscript. Our replies are shown below.

We firmly believe that the incorporation of routine bedside pocket-size ultrasound by non-experts as well as experts has the potential to greatly improve inpatient workflow and diagnostic accuracy at a low financial cost. Starting training with point-of-care ultrasonography in medical school will contribute to this goal.

With regards, on behalf of the authors,

Andersen, Garrett Newton, MD.

Annja Viset, MD.

Mjølstad, Ole Christian, MD.

Øyvind Salvesen Ph.D.

Dalen, Håvard, MD Ph.D.

Haugen, Bjørn Olav, MD Ph.D.

Reviewer's report
Title: Feasibility and accuracy of point-of-care pocket-size ultrasonography performed by medical students
Reviewer: Somashekhar Nimbalkar

Reviewer's report:

Summary: The authors have addressed most of the queries raised by the reviewers satisfactorily. However there may have been a better discussion if a connection with specific domains of learning in the medical students. There are still some errors in the limitations sections where words under 10 are expressed as figures.

Major Compulsory Revisions:
None

Minor Compulsory Revisions:
In the limitations section the numbers need to be expressed as words.

Authors Reply: This has been corrected as requested.

Discretionary Revisions:
Improvement in the discussion as to how PSID can improve learning. Its relevance to learning theories in medical education and how it can contribute to patient safety and improved quality of care in the long term.

Authors Reply: We have added some further text to this regard under discussion, specifically see Discussion, final paragraph, line 4-6; “Additionally, ultrasonography has been shown to increase the skills of medical students in core subjects such as anatomy, physiology, and physical examination [9, 14-18]”. We have also added “with an appropriate education program” to line 7 and in a physician’s career to line 8.
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