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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. From my first review not all points have been addressed, namely the 7th point, that your findings need to be grounded in evidence (i.e. in the literature). I see that in the Discussion (page 17), you have stated "In this study we have shown that clinical teaching consists of a spectrum of several teaching alternative, and is not previously described this way in the research literature". Can you be more explicit about the ways in which your findings differ from those of previous researchers? I am not completely convinced that you have found anything new.
2. Figure 2 should appear in the Results, not in the Discussion section of the paper.

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. It is unusual for references to be cited in the Abstract, and I would suggest that this be removed (reference #1).
2. The Conclusions of the Abstract are Ramsden's methods explained in the Introduction. Could you please rewrite the Conclusions in the Abstract, since it would seem there is no reason to conduct a study if the authors conclude that they have simply found what is already known.
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