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Reviewer's report:

Review Sullivan et al: Teaching faculty development in an undergraduate pediatric course: the use of peer observation of teaching

Sullivan et al. describe the development of a peer observation of teaching in an undergraduate paediatric course and the feedback on this given by email from the participating teachers.

Overall, this is a well written paper which is of interest for the medical education community.

I have some suggestions for improvement, which I envision as compulsory before a decision on publication can be made:

General comments:
If the papers main focus is the development of the peer observation of teaching, then the process on how this was developed and why in exactly this way should be described more in detail. E.g. has there been a needs assessment?
If the focus is more on the evaluation of this, evidence by asking faculty how they perceived it by email is rather weak as this is not anonymous and therefore might cause a biased picture. The reason why this “email” approach was used should be evidenced by the literature or a more structured anonymous feedback sought if still possible.

Abstract:
Teaching methods description in the results section has to be transferred to methods section.
In the methods section it must be stated that feedback was sought via email.

Introduction:
The research question should be made more concrete, e.g. incl. to name by whom the PoT method was assessed.

Discussion:
In the discussion the results of the study should be discussed in the light of the existing evidence (literature). So far there is almost no literature cited in the discussion.
Furthermore there is no paragraph on the limitations of this study.
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