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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for allowing me to review this manuscript by Wu et al. Briefly, this is study evaluating physicians who were given a brief ultrasound course and then given questionnaires regarding their experiences.

Introduction: I think the current introduction is too broad. I would suggest that the authors focus instead on POCUS in the hands of minimally trained physicians and cite other studies that have evaluated this similar question. I would suggest reviewing the Bernard article in more detail. The second paragraph of the introduction is quite long and has several articles listed. I would trim this paragraph down significantly. I would ask that a third paragraph be made in the introduction to specify the objectives of this study. Line 106, change starting to "starting".

Methods: the first paragraph needs significant modifications to include more details on the course. What type of study was this? Was there IRB approval? Did you get consent? Give us more information on the participants. This information is listed in the results but should be part of methods.

Discussion: I think this discussion is well written. I would focus a bit more on previous work and how your work is different or adds anything new to the literature. Consider proposing modifications or future studies.

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

No

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

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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