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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Language: Many sentences were not correctly written in English. One example is at page 5, last paragraph. Another problem is about terms not currently used like "medicine doctors" instead of physicians. This kind of incorrect translation make text very difficult to understand.

Methodology: It is not clear what about is the article. There is a confusion between showing the software (e-portfolio) and the research. The objetives listed on page 7 are not about a research. There is no articulation between objectives, methods, results, discussion and conclusions. Methods (page 8) talks about a qualitative research, but authors used a SPSS software to perform analysis. It is used for quantitative data! It is not clear which variables were collected among all instruments. Which kind of qualitative analysis was performed on qualitative data? It is not completely clear about population and sample.

In my point of view authors made confusion between competence and learning objetives. Data showed on table 3, first column are an example of this. Competence is a complex and not only a skill or knowledge, as authors estate into background (page 4 lines 6-8).

Abstract is poorly written missing information on subjects, objectives, methods, results and conclusion. We need that not about e-portfolio, but about the research itself.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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