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Reviewer’s report:

All of the suggestions are minor essential revisions.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

The purpose of this study was to explore medical student preparedness to care for LEP patients and to identify predictive factors. The research question was stated clearly. The background and literature review describing the issues was well presented.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

The methods are appropriate, although it was unclear when during the year the survey was administered. The authors state that it was administered for three months during 2009, but was this at the beginning or end of the school year?

3. Are the data sound?

No issues noted.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

No issues noted.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Overall the authors explain their findings adequately in light of the data, although there are some points to note:

- More information on the “session” devoted to the use of interpreters is needed. Considering one of the main conclusions made by the authors is that medical students need to be trained to effectively work with interpreters, how do the authors evaluate the training that is currently being done at their school? What is the duration of this session? Is this session the only time students are specifically taught these skills? Are ad-hoc opportunities frequent? How do the students evaluate this specific session? The authors strongly state that training medical students to work with interpreters may lead to better preparedness, but then only briefly refer to the training that does happen at their school, and provide no details on the effectiveness of the intervention.
• The data on students' first language not being associated with preparedness to care for LEP patients is an interesting finding that requires further exploration/study.

• More explanation on how the authors think their findings could be used in relation to the known fact that despite all of the resources available, training courses attended, and knowledge of the importance of using interpreters, physicians still persist in under using their services.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
The paper is well written.
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