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Reviewers report:

Background:
Page 4, paragraph 2. While POCUS in cardiac arrest is certainly important for diagnosis of etiology and guiding intervention, the current evaluation focuses on prognosis. You could include results that pertain POCUS guiding resuscitation and procedures in order to support this as an aim of the study as you additionally mention this aspect in your discussion. Alternatively, you could reshape your background to focus on the prognostic applications of POCUS in cardiac arrest, which better fits the current analysis.

Methods:
1. How many authors performed the literature search?
2. How did you evaluate validity of study design? i.e. randomization, blinding, and follow up rate.

Results:
Table 2 - I do not see Blaivas et al, kim et al, Breithkreutz et al, or Schuster et al. in the table. Is this intentional?
Tables 7 and 8 are slightly redundant. I like that you stratified results based on outcomes, but most of this data is in Table 3. Rates of intervention, or stratification based on etiology of arrest, traumatic vs non-traumatic may make a more interesting evaluation.

Discussion:
Page 10, line 29 - This sentence needs a conjunction.
I would like to see more regarding limits of your study design and limitations of the studies reviewed.

Conclusion:
Page 10, line 58 - How is this statement supported by your findings or cited literature? I would recommend citing literature in your discussion or intro regarding this or removing this statement.
Page 11, line 3 - I don't believe that your study really evaluates using POCUS to diagnose pathology. It may be best to limit this conclusion to prognostic value unless you include a subanalysis of the studies that demonstrate use of POCUS to diagnosis arrest etiology.
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