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**Reviewer’s report:**

Major compulsory revisions:
The paper should be shortened.

1) Course construction with constructive alignment should be discussed (J Biggs et al).
2) Limitations of the Kern framework should also be discussed.
3) In order to clarify the context, a brief description of the medical education curriculum should be added.
4) How were the 139 students selected? Please describe data regarding age and sex distribution.
5) How were the students selected to medical school? Were all selected by the same means?
6) Were tests, grades and interviews used in the same amount in all 139 students?
7) A description of the pedagogic, scientific and clinical experience as well as formal education of the 101 teachers must be added apart from age and sex distribution of the teachers.
8) Why were 101 teachers included?
9) During what time period did the study take place?
10) The question in the title of the paper “How good is our Undergraduate Musculoskeletal Education?” is not answered clearly enough. Please modify the title.
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**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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