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Reviewer's report:

This is a follow up to a companion paper previously published in BMC Medical Education. I therefore think that it is important that this companion follow up is published in the same place. It is an interesting qualitative take on an important subject, though qualitative data would also be informative at some point. It does paraphrase information from the previous paper, and for a conventional journal, I would have recommended a shorter text referring back to the first paper. For an e-journal, however, some repetition makes it more accessible.

This sentence on page 10 is garbled.

“Although the majority were glad they didn’t the amount of science lectures in the TMC they would have been comfortable with more science teaching.

I particularly loved this quote.

“as a group we felt we didn’t have enough particularly in anatomy….but you found out you didn’t need it…the main problems were the consultants asking questions on ward rounds..”

Is it worth using acronyms such as TMC and RMC? Just spell them out: this is an electronic journal, so space isn’t an issue. It makes it easier to read. Also GP can mean General Practice or General Practitioner. Stick to the latter and spell out the former.

The authors state:

“A good knowledge of physiology may help with understanding disease processes and physiology may be seen to be suitable for PBL (25) – whereas anatomy and pharmacology, for example may suit a more didactic teaching approach”.

However, I do not think you can draw even this tentative conclusion from the data. The real observation is that “Graduates THINK THAT a good knowledge of physiology may help with understanding disease processes and physiology may be seen to be suitable for PBL – whereas anatomy and pharmacology, for example may suit a more didactic teaching approach”. They MAY be completely wrong. You are, after all, dealing with culturally constructed expectations, a point which may be worth making more explicitly.
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