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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions

This manuscript addresses an important topic, i.e., assessing what quality of a video is optimal for pediatricians to make an accurate clinical judgment of the case. As the authors pointed out that video cases have been widely in medical education as well as telemedicine. It is especially true for cost-benefit analysis perspective because high quality videos are expensive to produce.

However, the aim of the study is to derive gold standard on video quality, but the data doesn't seem to be sufficient to address that question. Either further data collection should be conducted or the writing should be modified.

The second hypothesis doesn't seem to be addressed in the study.

Grammar error, L34, a paediatricians' judgment

Study design (Line 121-130) is quite difficult to read. Perhaps the authors can use a graphic to show the study design?

Each clip lasts about 20 seconds. How was this determined? How about using individual images instead of a video clip? How about also vary the lengths of videos and find out whether the length of a video makes a difference?

Some of the statements in Discussion were not well-supported. For example, the statements in Line 196-199 were not well supported. There is mismatch between this and the results in Lines 150-180.

It's great that the authors pointed out "Further studies are needed to elucidate the factors underlying a clinician's perception of video quality." Actually this should have been studied and established before the current study asking participants to rate the quality of the videos directly. Authors could add this as the study limitation.

Line 207-209 is not accurate. Participants’ prior knowledge on the topics also determines how much cognitive load an individual experiences.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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