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Reviewer's report:

The paper reported the qualitative feedbacks from the mini-CEX encounters.
1. The assessment instrument used in the method has a great differences from mini-CEX. I suggest use another name for the instrument.
2. The definition of feedback in the paper included reflection, feedback, and action plan. The term of feedback, used twice in paper, make reading very confused. I suggest that the authors reclassified your results using Holmboe's classification (Ref. 16) for further analysis.
3. Try to merge Table 2 and Table 3, use number (%) for easy understanding.

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, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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