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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
SPECIFICS:
1. Background -
   They use the term "unmasked" which could be better stated as "explore the relationship of team building."

2. Methods -
   Participants - University of Basel. Need to add city and country.
   Simulator - METI - With the initials, add state, site, city, and country of manufacturer.
   Study design - "Randomization" is spelled with "z" not an "s".
   Scenario - The arbitrary benchmarks of 15 and 20 seconds of cardiac arrest time need to be benchmarked from the available literature as to the assignments of these times to avoid the appearance of post-hoc manipulation. They need to reference the Likert scale.
   Data analysis - "Task assignment", "brainstorming", and other utterances are relative arbitrations and would be better served by more declarative educational reference points.
   Statistics - The clinical significance of the arbitrary 20 second timeframe need be established and the statistical methodology is cited typically for each comparison made.

3. Results -
   Secondary outcomes - They state that there are no protocol violations, but compression rates below 80 per minute were described.
   The median participants ratings were cited and need to be externally benchmarked.

4. Discussion -
   The paragraph discussing "rating of one owns team performance did not correlate with objective performance measures." - This is the most important part
of study and should be emphasized.

5. Declaration of competing interest -
I believe this is a real and substance and can effect subsequent evaluation of this work.

6. Summary -
My position remains the same in that this study has a narrow area of interest and focus. However, the authors have performed admirably in regards to concerns and criticisms and should be congratulated on their efforts.

**Level of interest:** An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.