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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your attentive and thorough response to the reviewer comments.

• The improved Introduction lays a more solid foundation for the study, and those same themes and references are integrated into the Discussion in an informative way.

• My confusion with one of the Methods explanations has been cleared up and I'm pleased to see you used a very recent version of Excel.

• The reporting of tables 3 and 4 is very clean and easy to follow now; the tables look good as well.

• The comments from attendees in Table 1 being used as points for future research is appropriate.

I. Major Compulsory Revisions

None.

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.

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.

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.
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.

Thank you again for this study, I look forward to seeing it in print.
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