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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
None.

Minor Essential Revisions

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.

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?

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

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.

Page 31, Table 6, ii. “Aspects of video quality can be overlooked” – is this backed up by the data?

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

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

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].”

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

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

Page 14: “8 students [30], this number” – should be a new sentence or
Table 3: “Use in SGTR.” – this term needs explaining within the table

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

Page 20: “creating video resources, these guidelines” – split the sentence

Page 20: “as a benefiting consolidation”

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

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

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

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

“resource, they felt” – new sentence

Page 29: “teachers own beliefs” – teachers’

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