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Reviewer's report:

It was a pleasure to review the manuscript, "Identifying Barriers to the Use of Ultrasound in Perioperative Period:..." by Chui et al.

As a minor point, the title should read ...in the Perioperative Period.

In brief, the authors sought survey responses from 266 anesthesia clinicians about ultrasound practices and received a 25% response. As an oversimplification, about 60% of the responders felt access to ultrasound machines was rate limiting.

That the issue is felt settled by the Canadian Anesthesia Association is evidenced by the quote from reference 5.

Methodology.

A 48 question survey that took 30-45 minutes to complete, seems to have been a design flaw. Given what you now know, might it make sense to resurvey the 266 with a farmer focused and shorter questionnaire?

Is there data from another source to know the overall demographics of the 266 clinicians so this 25% can be placed in context. An obvious bias is those who chose to spend the 1/2 hour may have been polar opposites as either luddites or zealots.

Finally, there are clearly policy issues associated with these conclusions. Can the authors present a back-of-the-envelope estimate of the cost necessary to provide 100% access? Given the data in the literature, it might be possible to estimate a value added (in reducing complications and/or OR time.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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