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1. Discuss the primary aim of this study. How did the study objectives change over time, given difficulties in recruiting participants?

2. Discuss the power analysis for a noninferiority study and how it compares to a superiority study. Which design typically requires more participants to achieve power?

3. Discuss how the authors designed the rating of clinical quality of images obtained. How could the determination of quality be improved?

4. What were the main findings of the study? Do the findings support the conclusion that virtual transvaginal ultrasonography is noninferior to in-clinic ultrasound evaluation?

5. Clarius Mobile Health, the manufacturer of this device, was involved in all aspects of the study design, data acquisition, and analyses. Discuss the risks and benefits of such involvement. Does the involvement strengthen or weaken the rigor of this study?

6. Discuss what mobile health applications are used in your clinical practice, if any. What areas are amenable to mobile health in your practice?

7. The authors state the benefit of this device lies partly in its ability to expand access to transvaginal ultrasonography. Discuss whether you agree with this statement and why or why not.

8. This device is already cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for in-clinic use. Discuss what FDA clearance compared with approval means for medical devices.