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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions:

The concept that this is a team activity makes the analysis complex. That said, greater clarity in the explanation of how the scenario was performed would be of use. Essentially, while there are 168 students in the study, it appears that only 19 of them actually did the task of telephone referral. Were the same students measured immediately post-education and again at 6 months? What impact did the change in ‘teams’ or groups have on performance?

Regarding the questionnaire, if 8 groups of students did not receive the education on ISBAR (the control groups), why were the percentages about what the acronym represented so high (76.3% to 96.3%)? I may have missed something in the explanation of how the training was conducted.

More detail on the training would be useful to other medical educators who hope to implement a similar program at their institution.

Minor essential revisions - check grammar. Some sentences did not include the full stop (.) at the end.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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