

## First Revision

Reviewer #1: there are no specific comments

Reviewer #2:

1 Title. The strong part of the study is the comparison between radiology resident and pediatric radiologists. The title should reflect this.

**Reply:** Title has been revised in keeping with the objectives and highlighted in bold font.

2 Abstract. "Ultrasound training may be easily imparted to healthcare workers other than radiologists, such as physicians in the NICU." This sentence is a further inference which is not supported by the findings. Please revise.

**Reply:** Agree with the reviewer. This sentence has been removed from revised manuscript.

3. Key words. Appropriate.

4. Background. Appropriate.

5. Methods. I cannot understand why the patients with "had prior CT Brain or MRI brain imaging" was excluded, please explain.

**Reply:** Patients who had prior cross-sectional imaging including CT and/or MRI were excluded to eliminate bias in ultrasound reporting because of already known findings. This has also been detailed in material and methods section.

6. Results. Appropriate

7. Discussion. The second and the third paragraphs are pertinent and unnecessary they can be omitted. The conclusion is not related with the findings, it mentions about pediatricians. Please revise. As an addition to the limitation section, the findings was not confirmed with a gold standard test such as MRI, the study only assess the inter observer variability.

**Reply:** Agreed. These two paragraphs have been removed.

8. Illustrations and tables. Figures are unnecessarily large; the useless parts should be cut from the margins.

**Reply:** Corrected.

9. Biostatistics. Appropriate.

10. Units. Appropriate.

11. References. Appropriate.

12. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Appropriate.

13. Research methods and reporting. Appropriate.

14. Ethics statements. Appropriate

Reviewer #3:

Interesting study and wonderful results. Methods are correctly done and results show no difference. It is publishable.

**Second Revision:**

1. This file of Answering reviewers is not correct; please refer to the attached example for further reply.

**Reply:** Corrected.

2. Audio core tip: Please offer the audio core tip, the requirement are as follows: In order to attract readers to read your full-text article, we request that the first author make an audio file describing your final core tip. This audio file will be published online, along with your article. Please submit audio files according to the following specifications: Acceptable file formats: .mp3, .wav, or .aiff  
Maximum file size: 10 MB. To achieve the best quality, when saving audio files as an mp3, use a setting of 256 kbps or higher for stereo or 128 kbps or higher for mono. Sampling rate should be either 44.1 kHz or 48 kHz. Bit rate should be either 16 or 24 bit. To avoid audible clipping noise, please make sure that audio levels do not exceed 0 dBFS.

**Reply:** Audible core tip added.

3. Regarding the figures: Please provide the decomposable figure of figures, whose parts are all movable and editable, organize them into a PowerPoint file, and submit as "Manuscript No. - Figures.ppt" on the system, we need to edit the words in the figures. All submitted figures, including the text contained within the figures, must be editable. Please provide the text in your figure(s) in text boxes.

**Reply:** Changes made in figures.

4. Please provide the decomposable TABLE; whose parts are movable and words can be edited.

**Reply:** Changes made in tables.

5. STROBE Statement is not qualified. Please refer to the attached file for re-submission.

**Reply:** STROBE checklist is attached.

6. Please complete all the revisions based on the version of "9175-76249-v1", and upload above mentioned files in a ".zip" file

**Reply:** Zip file added.