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Reviewer's report:

I appreciate the author’s efforts to answer all of the reviewer comments. The manuscript has significantly improved both in readability as well as comments. I have no major compulsory revisions to suggest.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. I appreciate the efforts to clarify the grading of the questionnaire. Given the subjective nature of the admission orders, and the variability of student responses, further data is needed. Please present the kappa value of agreement between the two faculty members grading the admission orders.

2. Although the authors purport to be evaluating both knowledge acquisition and retention, the study design can really only assess knowledge acquisition. Given the heterogeneity of the populations and the inability to present any data as to when students were exposed to the standardized order sets, retention cannot be claimed. This can truly only be assessed with a post-questionnaire administered months after the rotation has ended. The manuscript should be revised to reflect only knowledge acquisition.

3. The authors modified their methods to provide a measure of workload for students; however, it remains unclear if the number of patients expected is reflective of 3rd year students, 4th year students or both. Please clarify the workload expectations for 3rd year versus 4th year students.

4. In the final paragraph of the outcome measures, please change the primary outcome measure to the total score on the AW or AECOPD sections. As it stands currently, the language of "the score of the whole questionnaires" suggests that both sections were combined.

5. The last sentence in the eighth limitation is awkward. Revise for clarity: "It is possible that the intervention group scores would be lower if the proportion of fourth year students were equal between comparison groups."

6. For readability, begin a new paragraph with each limitation.
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