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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Lisa, Jenny and Peter,

Thank you for considering our manuscript and for sending feedback from your review process. We appreciate the comments and suggestions provided by your reviewers and have updated the manuscript accordingly. We have listed each of the reviewers’ points in turn and provided a short explanation of our response (highlighted in bold in the box below). Revisions to the manuscript have been made using ‘track changes’ and we hope it will be clear to see where these updates have been implemented.

With best wishes,
Mandy Roshier, Neil Foster, Michael Jones

Referee 1
Referee 1 highlighted the following as ‘minor essential revisions’:
1. Methods: The selection of students should be clarified. It is also not clear how many videos were produced, over how long they were available. Nor is it clear how students were recruited for focus groups, over which period of time these occurred, and how they related temporally to the introduction of videos and indeed to assessments.

   We thank the referee for their comments and have added the requested details to the manuscript.

2. Results: There is insufficient detail given in terms of the number of students in total and the number in focus groups and the number of videos. What proportion of students were included in the focus groups? The student characteristics are not given — is there data on their gender and age?

   We have addressed the referee’s comments and the information has been added into the relevant part of the methods section.
   - Gender information has been provided.
   - The referee asks if we have data on the gender and age. We have this data but feel it would not add greatly to the arguments present in the paper. We have not included specific information on the students’ age as due to the numbers of students involved and the distributions of students this could breach anonymity in this study.

3. Page 28: “Selection of students was on a voluntary basis”. The process of student selection should be reported in methods.

   As requested we have put details of the student selection into the methods, p14.

4. Page 27: “They recommended groups size for focus groups of up to eight students and our year groups were three, four and five students.” The group numbers should be reported in results.

   We have placed the group sizes for the focus groups in the methods section.
5. Page 31, Table 6, ii. “Aspects of video quality can be overlooked” – is this backed up by the data?

The guideline that “aspects of video quality can be overlooked” is based on findings from our study and the research literature, please see p25.

6. Discussion: There are references to the limitations of the study but they are not clearly stated in their own paragraph in the discussion.

The limitations of the study have been presented in the context of specific themes; the intension of this is to avoid the requirement for the reader to cross reference between sections and to restrict the length of the manuscript by avoiding repetition of specific text.

Referee 1 suggested amendments listed in points 7-22; these have all been amended in the revised manuscript as requested.

7. Page 5 “student’s from different year groups” should read “students”’

8. Incomplete sentence end of page 5: “While other reported uses of video technology in veterinary medicine are comparable with other fields of medicine, such as use in anatomy and surgery [18,19] and pathology [20].”

9. Page 7: “(WebCT or Web Course Tools1), this space” should be a new sentence “. This space”.

10. Page 12: “(the resources we direct them to.” Close brackets.

11. Page 14: “8 students [30], this number” – should be a new sentence or semicolon.

12. Table 3: “Use in SGTR.” – this term needs explaining within the table

13. Table 3: “Themes are based on authors categorisation” should read “authors’ “

14. Page 20: “creating video resources, these guidelines” – split the sentence “as a benefiting consolidation”

15. Page 20: “The students highlight” – stick to past tense

16. Page 20: “The students highlight several features which indicate usage of this media at their own pace such as downloading, and when and where they access the videos, convenience.” Sentence needs revision

17. Page 20: “The students highlight several features which indicate usage of this media at their own pace such as downloading, and when and where they access the videos, convenience.” Sentence needs revision

18. Page 21: “Four key themes within the items of weakness were rated as important by students (Table 4), accessibility, quality and the context in which videos were used in teaching.” – incomplete sentence

19. Page 22: “The students rated three areas where improvements may be made, accessibility, content and quality.” – I think a colon or additional word is required to introduce the list

20. “resource, they felt” – new sentence
21. Page 29: “teachers own beliefs” – teachers’ -

22. Page 31, table “6, ii) 8. Our students” – guidelines should not refer to “our students”

**Referee 2**

The authors are encouraged to consider the following suggestions.
1. The manuscript although interesting is rather very long and will benefit from some reductions.

   We thank the referee for their comments. We have reduced the length of the manuscript accordingly to reduce any major repetition and make it more concise.

2. What were the criteria for selection of students recruited to the focus group discussion?

   We have added the requested information into the methods section on page 14 of the manuscript.

3. How many of them were males/females?

   We have added these details into the method section of the manuscript as requested.

4. The study has not determined to what extent each gender and other demographic factors contribute to the students’ perceptions of the study objectives?

   The method used in this study precluded an evaluation of the impact of gender and demographic on perception. We have acknowledged in the manuscript that the views obtained through the study may not be representative of all students however they enable an insight into how this resource can be developed.

5. Can the ‘Moo Tube’ be used in the continued professional development of practicing veterinarians?

   ‘Moo Tube’ is a facility on WebCT which is currently only available to students. However, the videos and additional resources (such as quizzes) can and be disseminated elsewhere, providing the videos are not subject to any copyright. While we feel that dissemination of resources is important we have not specifically addressed this as it is not a direct aim of the work and would add extra length to the manuscript. The University of Nottingham is looking to move towards a more open access policy on teaching resources but it is beyond the scope of this study to discuss this.