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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this article. I found the following when reviewing the manuscript.

Background

What do the authors consider as training in POCUS? The question is: Can be the 2 minutes introduction really called as training? There should be some definition of what is called training at the beginning.

I suggest moving part about differences in paramedic's training into the "Background" (page 12, line 287 - 290). The readers might have this question at the beginning of the article. It might be good to show earlier that the review counts with this variance.

Results

The manuscript is focused more on the description of the published studies in general and on the impact of described training, than on the educational curricula. The title and the aim of the research question is "Educational Curricula for Training Paramedic in Ultrasound". After this review authors did not show the curricula.

Conclusion

The suggestions for future research are meaningful. Authors includes also the fact that training and levels of paramedics are vary around a world, which can make results of all future studies different. Authors should include into the suggestions also undergraduate paramedic training as a pre-preparation for future POCUS training.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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