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Reviewer’s report:

The paper is ameliorated a lot, congratulations.
I have some remarks mostly on the way the data are reported.
Introduction: still too long and containing unnecessary information. The background situation is fine. The description of studies comparing lectures versus RP/SP is not essential in this paper, it is not the scope of this article. Please skip. The description of the studies dealing with the comparison of RP versus SP is good and the critical analysis is fine. The research questions are OK now.
Methods OK no remarks
Results OK
Discussion needs some adjustments. To my opinion at this moment there is no discussion, it is just a more general description of the results. Please clarify the mean result: RP versus SP are both acceptable and realistic. Nevertheless SP are perceived as having better effect. These are the only results, but they are important. Please reflect on that. Make the discussion more precise, skip all the things that already have been said, especially those of the methods. You can skip nearly all the sentences like 'we provide highly relevant cases...' p14. Make the discussion shorter.
The RP scenarios which are less elaborated are seen as realistic as well. This is a fine conclusion, since working with SP is expensive and more time is needed to make a good case, RP with peers is a good alternative. This is a more important conclusion than the fact that the trainers did a good job by briefing and debriefing. It is essential/normal that trainers are good.
Limitations of the study: please stay to limitations like no generalization to non-students, no investigation of real performance, only perceptions of the students... you do not need to emphasize the good methodology of the study.
Conclusion deals with important topics that should be placed and worked out in the discussion.
Still some work to do to make this a good paper.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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