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This paper is a revised manuscript describing a study of the retention of basic science information over time by medical students in a predominately case-based curricular program. The questions addressed in this report are of value to the medical education community and will reinforce our current thinking. The conclusions and thoughts regarding the outcomes are worthwhile. The authors have made a very commendable effort to address the issues identified by the reviewers and editors. I am very impressed in the enhanced clarity and thoroughness of the revised manuscript. I believe the authors have significantly improved the quality and value of this work,

Aside from a few very minor issues that I have noted (see below), I would recommend that this paper be ACCEPTED and move forward to publication processing. I am very much looking forward to seeing it in print so I can share it with my colleagues.

Minor editorial points (these are things that will, be picked up in the editorial and proofing process, but simply offer these as I happened to note them):
• Page 4, line 12: space after period following [14].
• Page 5, line 24: consider ‘drawing’ rather than ‘draw’
• Page 9, line 12: Should Additional file 1 in also reference Supplement and the location?

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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