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Dear Editor!

Thank you for your valuable comments regarding our revised manuscript and for your judgement that the manuscript may be published with some improvements. We have revised the manuscript and tried to respond to your requests as far as possible. You will find our comments (in black) and changes according to the respective reviewer's report below and in the attached manuscript.

Reviewer: Andreas Holzinger
Reviewers report:
Not 1: Please run a careful spell check - there are some typos, e.g. Et al. -> et al. (last page - just as an example)
Not 2: You could elaborate a little bit more on performance, e.g. on page 12, for this purpose you might find the following two papers helpful for you as related work:

Regarding Reviewers report:
Not 1: We have carried out a language check and entered changes in several sections.
Not 2: Thanks for the valuable input of the referenced articles. With regard to the present extent of the discussion we haven’t found it feasible to make major changes in the text, but a clarification has been made in the discussion, section 3: The Swedish admission system for medical studies is mainly based on high grades and on expected high theoretical academic performance. It might be assumed that these students have a high capacity to adapt their studies to different learning situations. This may affect the ability to generalize our results to other groups of students.

Reviewer: Margit Pohl
Reviewers report:
Not 1: "I was also a little bit disappointed that the authors do not report whether usage of the e-learning systems was influenced by computer/internet usage or ranking of pedagogic value of electronic teaching media (asked in a questionnaire). I would find this a valuable addition to the paper."

Not 2:
In their conclusion, the authors write:
Among medical students, neither learning styles according to ILS, nor a number of other studied characteristics seem to influence the choice to use a web-based ECG programme. This finding was consistent also when usage of the different modules in the programme were analysed. Thus, web-based learning programmes can attract a broad variety of medical students.
I would strongly suggest that the authors reformulate the last sentence. The hypotheses that there are no differences between groups can never be proven. You might say that you did not find any differences and that this suggests that web-based learning may attract a broad variety of students, but as it is I think the argument is too strong.

Not 1: We have made this addition in the results section:
Ranking of the educational benefits
The users were asked to rank the educational benefits of the learning modules based on a six-graded scale (1- poor to 6 – very useful). On average the students ranked “Learning content” 4.5 (SD 1.2), “Self-assessment questions” 4.6 (SD 1.1), and “Interactive ECG interpretation training” 5.0 (SD 1.3).

Not 2: The concluding sentence in the abstract text has been changed to:

This finding was consistent also when the usage of the different modules in the programme were considered. Thus, the findings suggest that web-based learning may attract a broad variety of medical students.

We hope that you will find the revised manuscript satisfactory enough for publication.

With kind regards
Mikael Nilsson
mikael.nilsson@karolinska.se