Reviewer’s report

Title: Musculoskeletal Ultrasound Workshops in Post-graduate Physician Training: A Pre- and Post-workshop Survey of 156 Participants

Version: 0 Date: 03 Feb 2019

Reviewer: Jillian Clarke

Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article. It is a thoughtful, interesting and well-illustrated account of an educational program which needs just small amendments to scholarly writing and some typographical errors corrected.

The two substantive amendments are:

1. Line 76:

'Compared with cardiac, renal, breast, and gynecological sonography, which target only specific organ regions, musculoskeletal ultrasonography (MSKUS) comprises dynamic evaluations and/or assessments of different structures (the ligaments, tendons, muscles, vessels and nerves [2-5])'

This comparison should be avoided, as almost all ultrasound examinations are dynamic, and every ultrasound examination requires assessment of multiple different structures. Further, each of the mentioned anatomical areas (cardiac, renal, breast, gynecology) involves multiple surrounding structures that are included in the ultrasound assessment. Please revise.

2. Line 317 - Limitations section. It is important in this section to acknowledge the simple nature of the questions asked of participants, and the lack of use of an educational evaluation theoretical model (e.g. Kirkpatrick's Four Levels, or equivalent). This has been partially accomplished in the 'third limitation' but should be enhanced.

Minor changes required:

Line 54 - quotation marks at end of sentence should be removed

Line 85 - 'obese' rather than 'obess'

Line 90 - needs a supporting reference

Line 106 - 'method' rather than 'way'
111 - whether physicians felt it useful
137 - regional
161 - respond to the questionnaires
178 - the relationship of Reference 13 to the statement is unclear
192 - Three courses had been held annually
236 - how was 'previous experience' defined?
253 to end of paragraph - the meaning is unclear, please revise
260 - 'The perceived confidence, apart from perceived usefulness' What do you mean by this? Please clarify
301 - 'older' rather than 'elder'
307 - 'hands-on' rather than 'hand-on'
342 - hands-on
362 - Author's contributions - there is duplication of the contributions of K-VC, please revise
372 - 'The' rather than 'the'
Appendix 1 - Preworkshop rather than preworkshop
Appendix 2 - evaluation rather than evaluation
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