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**Reviewer’s report:**

This paper described medical students' perceived preparedness to care for LEP patients. A validated resident questionnaire was modified for medical students and explored their attitudes, preparedness, and year of training as it related to providing cross-cultural care to patients.

The question posed by the authors was somewhat well-defined although the study is about self-perceived preparedness, not evaluated/assessed preparedness.

The methods are appropriate and well described, and the data is sound.

The manuscript adheres to relevant standards for reporting, and the discussion and conclusions are fairly well balanced.

The limitations are clearly stated.

The authors acknowledged work upon which they are building.

While the abstract is fine, perhaps the title could include the words "self-perceived" for clarity?

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1. Background: Regarding the literature review, it might be more accurate to cite more original sources in a couple of instances. Statements cited by #12 and #15 have more original sources than those articles.

2. Background: Please check reference #2. It does not seem to be the right reference for the three sentences that cited it.

3. Methods, first paragraph: Sentences 1 and 2 are slightly confusing. It sounds like the questions from the “Medical Students Preparedness to Deliver Cross-cultural Care and Perspectives on Cross-cultural Training at HMS” survey were the ones modified. Perhaps you meant the following in sentence 2, “The majority of questions came from a modified validated survey used to explore preparedness to provide cross-cultural care among physicians completing their residency training.” If not, please clarify.

4. Discussion, fourth paragraph: See my comments regarding the Conclusion. This paragraph either a) belongs in the Background section as part of the literature review, or b) needs to be rewritten so that it relates to your study’s findings, or c) should be deleted as it is irrelevant.
5. Discussion, fifth paragraph: The last sentence is confusing. How does Spanish language proficiency explain the EFFECT of Hispanic ethnicity on self-perceived preparedness? Could you expand or clarify the wording on why medical students' first language did not correlate to increased preparedness to care for LEP patients?

6. Conclusions, last sentence: The conclusions answer different research questions. Suggestion #1 addresses medical school curricula, which is somewhat relevant to the results of your data. #2 is a suggestion for admissions and does not speak to your research purpose of exploring the students' self-perceived preparedness to care for LEP patients.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Methods, Explanatory Variables, third paragraph: What do you mean by “investigated educational factors?” Maybe the sentence could be simplified by just stating you compared self-perceived skill level in work with interpreters by year in medical school. Other than their year in medical school, I don't see other educational factors discussed. Please clarify.

2. Discussion, third paragraph: I like the conclusion in that paragraph. (Just a comment; no changes necessary)
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