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Reviewer's report:

It is a very interesting article for educators who want to introduce Peer Observation of Teaching or are looking for new models of Faculty development.

My suggestions are

Major Compulsory Revision

a. Change the title to Peer Observation of Teaching as a Faculty Development Tool and delete Teaching and undergraduate course.

b. The article is really about the perception of teachers who volunteer for PoT using a qualitative approach but it is not very clear.

c. Methods: In the observation section authors have stated that a short questionnaire was administered at the end of every session and a copy is also attached but it is not clear if this questionnaire was adapted/modified for different types of session e.g. group discussion.

d. Similarly in the post observation feedback does the written summary include both observer's report and students' evaluation or just the observer's report.

e. Results Section: The details provided may be included in Methods and Results should just focus on the analysis of the qualitative data.

f. Similarly in the Discussion Section it should clearly state that the Faculty perceives PoT as a useful technique....

g. Fig 1: has missing alphabets

Minor Essential revision

h. There are no details about observers what training they receive? Does this process help them in their professional development? (if this data could be included that would add value).

i. In the post observation session was there any discussion on how to go about any concerns raised or identified by the observer/students or was just a feedback session where the findings were discussed? It would be helpful for readers to know.

Discretionary Revision

a. Abstract. The last line in the Conclusion can be deleted or perhaps rephrased.

b. Introduction: The second quotation on page 4 has got some words in bold which does not seem necessary.
c. Methods: The general approach that was adopted for PoT was based on Bell’s model? If so it may be indicated here rather than referring to the Fig.1

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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