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Reviewer's report:

I have the following comments:

1) ABSTRACT: should be shorter by about 30-50% and more closely focused on the study findings. In particular, the Background section should be reduced to at most two paragraphs describing the aim of the study, and the Results section should report quantitative data along with their statistical significance (P-values, etc.). Moreover, the number of trained students (28) should be reported in the Materials and Methods section.

2) BACKGROUND: should be shorter as well for better reader clarity and greater overall manuscript compactness. To this purpose, I suggest that some parts of the background that could be useful to comment the study findings be moved into the Discussion section (which, in turn, does not provide a comparison with data from the existing literature in its current form).

3) RESULTS: a) confidence scores were expressed using a 5-point Likert scale, so it would seem more appropriate to compare data using a Wilcoxon test instead of a paired t test (which is not suited for ordinal data); b) quantitative scores before and after training should be reported numerically (in terms of median, max and min values), not only graphically via Fig. 1. I strongly suggest that such data be provided in a separate table, along with the p-values of each pre/post-training comparison.

4) DISCUSSION: as outlined in comment #2 above, the study findings should also be compared systematically with data from the existing literature. This is important in order to put them into a broader perspective and highlight their contribution to the current knowledge on the topic of early medical education in ultrasound.
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