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Dear Drs. Anderson and Sorrentino,

Please find a point by point response to the reviewer comments below. Thank you for taking the time to improve our manuscript.

Best Regards,

Matthew McInnes MD FRCPC

I. Major Compulsory Revisions: None.

**Author response:** Thank you!

II. Minor Essential Revisions

1. Your handling of the Image Quality parameter is acceptable. The improved Introduction provides a context and a reference for the criteria that you utilize to score that parameter, which greatly improves its validity. My only suggestion would be to work a citation for reference 3 into the paragraph where you explain how you collected these data, just to remind the reader that this “subjective” parameter has roots in previous studies.

**Author response:** Great suggestion. The following sentence/citation were added in the methods: ‘The basis for the framework of the image quality evaluation was derived from frequently cited image quality criticisms in a prior study of radiology lectures (3).’

2. Another interesting result that came out of table 4A is that both the HSG and LSG were evenly split between didactic style and unknown cases. Table 3A confirms little difference between the response to these presentation styles.

Results showing that lecture framework (didactic versus case-style) doesn’t
necessarily correlate with positive audience response may be of interest to some readers. This could be highlighted briefly in the Results and Discussion.

**Author response:** Excellent observation. *Added to discussion:* ‘An additional interesting finding is that the HSG and LSG (tables 3A and 4A) contain the same proportion of didactic vs. case-based lectures indicating that lecture style alone is not a determinant of success or failure.’

3. My final suggestion is to tune up the Conclusions. The last three sentences should have more confident language and give this thoughtful study the wrap-up it deserves.

**Author response:** Good suggestion. *Conclusion re-vamped to be more confident and informative:* ‘This study identifies that there are many determinants of high quality Diagnostic Imaging review course lectures. The factors that most strongly contribute to lecture success are: high quality images; use of fewer images per case; use of special effects which clearly and precisely convey imaging findings or clarify difficult concepts; use of pretest/posttest tools and perhaps most importantly—a sprinkling of humor. These findings can assist in optimizing lecture preparation and guide further research.’

III. Discretionary Revisions

1. I like that you included a statement about scores for presenters who gave more than one presentation in the Discussion. Could that data be shown in a small table? You don’t need to do much more with it, but the statement does seem a little random. I leave this at the authors’ discretion unless the Editor feels strongly about it.

**Author response:** Good point. *This was added based on another reviewer’s comments and does seem out of place. This sentence was removed from the discussion.*