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Reviewer's report:

Over all an excellent investigation of an active teaching format compared to conventional teaching methods.

Major Compulsory Revisions

None.

Minor Essential Revisions

The article would improve if the general effect of educational interventions with different formats on knowledge transfer/practice outcome would be mentioned in one paragraph; see e.g.:


Could you please describe a bit more precisely the study design:

"To assess initial knowledge achievement, we distributed 5 multiple-choice questions based on topics covered in the conference. These questions were constructed similarly to those in the American Board of Internal Medicine certification exam.

Do you mean 5 questions after every conference (total = 20 questions)?

"To assess long-term knowledge retention, we distributed 20 multiple-choice questions 4-6 weeks after the lecture series. The same 5 questions were given after each of the 4 conferences."

What do you mean with “the same 5 questions” after “we distributed 20 multiple-choice questions…”? The same 20 questions?

Long-term Knowledge Retention

Please add a table with the results of the results for the long-term knowledge retention results.

Discretionary Revisions

Make the research question may be a bit more explicit:

For example:

Will the ACTIVE teaching format improve …
1st the participant’s knowledge?
2nd the long-term knowledge retention?
3rd the satisfaction of the participants?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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