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Dear Editor,

Many thanks for your reviewer’s comments and an opportunity to further revise our paper. I wish to re-submit our revised manuscript entitled: “Context dependent memory in two learning environments: the tutorial room and the operating theatre” for consideration for publication in *BMC Medical Education*.

I might address each of your comments individually:

Regarded the necessary repetition of recall tests on four occasions and it’s potential for practice effect or fatigue modulating recall ability, this is something we considered but did not adequately address in our discussion. This has now been addressed in a new paragraph on the end of page 8 and beginning of page 9, which specifically references a paper by Falleti, which describes practice effect and fatigue.

Regarding student’s curiosity in the study methodology, this is addressed in an additional paragraph 2, page 9.

Omitting the impressive meta-analysis by Smith & Vela (2001), was a major error on our part and an effort to embed this extremely relevant paper into our introduction and discussion has been attempted with an additional paragraph 2, page 4 and also again in paragraph 2, page 8.

An additional table has been created to more clearly display the individual results of each of the participants, making it much more clear. Figures 2 & 3 have been omitted, although a sentence confirming the Gaussian distribution of recall scores remains in the first paragraph of the results section.

Regarding a clear distinction between “same context effect” and “specific context effect”, this has been addressed in an adaption of the last paragraph of the introduction and also in the results section.
Regarding … “foruth paragraph in results section needs adaption”…. This has now been re-written.

Each of the individual points in the “minor issues” section have been addressed individually.

I hope you are satisfied with our revisions and I look to your response.

Many thanks,

Andrew Coveney,
Surgical Registrar / lecturer.