

Reviewer's comments reply	Reply
<p>Reviewer #1:</p> <p><b>Scientific Quality:</b> Grade C (Good)</p> <p><b>Language Quality:</b> Grade A (Priority publishing)</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Minor revision</p> <p><b>Specific Comments to Authors:</b> First- It is feasible to use Tele-Robo ultrasound as a way to provide care to covid patients as well as other areas where there is need for distancing or in far to reach places. This was also considered safe and acceptable by the participants.</p> <p>Second- Although the results can not be considered conclusive in advocating for the use of tele-robo ultrasound, its clinical applicability is still great even considering the prohibitive costs.</p> <p>Third- Its high prohibitive cost, its need for extensive training in both robotics, computing/network management and ultrasound may make it only applicable to niche markets suck as NASA and other arctic companies with both the need and financing to perform and fund the use of the program. Perhaps with advancement in technology, this can become more relevant and feasible.</p>	<p>Accepted and modified.</p> <p>Accepted and modified.</p> <p>Accepted and modified.</p>
<p>Reviewer #2:</p> <p><b>Scientific Quality:</b> Grade C (Good)</p> <p><b>Language Quality:</b> Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Minor revision</p> <p><b>Specific Comments to Authors:</b> read the article entitled "Tele-robotic ultrasound: an initial feasibility study". I congratulate them on their brilliant initiative. I believe the authors could be more emphatic in changing the title of the study to Robotic-ultrasound: an initial feasibility study". In my opinion, one of the main limitations of the study would be the cost of the robot (creation, development, installation and operation) to perform the US. This cost, the authors believe, can be justified by the pandemic, but my question is can it be expanded, for example, to perform endoscopies?</p> <p>It seems obvious that it is also justified for the realization during the pandemic, but could the authors talk about other more futuristic technical idealizations? It also seems that help from a larger auxiliary team is needed, the authors could explain more in this context.</p>	<p>Accepted and modified.</p> <p>The title is modified as advised.</p> <p>We agree that the cost of robots is the major limiting factor. It can be expanded to other areas such as endoscopies.</p> <p>Developing the robotic system needed engineering support. Hence, a larger auxiliary team is needed during the initial stages of the project.</p>

<p>What would the coupling agent be that can be done by engineering technicians or by engineers?</p> <p>The authors say, "However, the team does not need to remain close to the patient throughout the study and can maintain a safe distance once the patient is positioned and a coupling agent has been applied. It does not seem contradictory to what you already say. that in the conventional US only the doctor would be exposed to contamination in times of a pandemic to put more people in a room?</p> <p>Clarify more what the authors call the learning curve? Do the authors believe that the US performed by Robo can provide better images than a conventional US?</p> <p>I think that the authors should increase the sample, in order to obtain more robust conclusions.</p>	<p>The coupling agent is ultrasound jelly, which is required to be applied for image acquisitions in ultrasound</p> <p>Accepted and modified.</p> <p>Learning curve refers to synchronizing the robotic arm movement using the haptic device so that appropriate quality images are obtained. The ability to maneuver the haptic device by the doctor requires a lot of practice and precision.</p> <p>The authors are continuing the study with more sample size, so conclusive evidence can be obtained.</p>
<p><b>LANGUAGE POLISHING REQUIREMENTS</b></p>	<p>Performed</p>