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Reviewer’s report:

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS:

1. The authors state that over 500 of their students worked on development of the models. What percentage of the total student population does this represent? Did most students participate? Only a small percentage of a much larger population? This discussion should be amplified briefly.

2. The authors illustrate 5 specific models that were developed and used. There should be a larger list of the 118 models, or at least a list that groups the models by systems (e.g. 8 respiratory, 14 neuroscience, etc...).

3. Readers would like to know which model types are easier to construct and most effective for instruction. The paper should include more discussion regarding relative success in building the models, and which models were more/less effective as learning tools.

Level of interest: An article of importance 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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