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Reviewer's report:

Review:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, the aims and obtained results correspond very well.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes, the methods are well described.

   I would recommend attaching the copy of questionnaire (translated into English) to the paper.*

   Was the questionnaire validated? How? This should be included into the manuscript. **

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes, the data provided are very suggestive and described in detail, illustrated with three tables.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes, however, I would recommend to condense the conclusions only to major results (take-away message) and not to repeat the method and results like in abstract.**

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes.
9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes.

I recommend acceptation of this manuscript for publication. The data provided are very illustrative and I found many similar results with our situation in Slovakia (see Mokry J, Mokra D. Opinions of medical students on the pre-graduate scientific activities--how to improve the situation? Biomed Pap Med Fac Univ Palacky Olomouc Czech Repub. 2007 Jun;151(1):147-9 and Mokry J, Sevecova D, Sulaj M. Student scientific activities at Jessenius Faculty of Medicine, Comenius University in Martin--current state and its future. Bratisl Lek Listy. 2004;105(1):25-9.)

*Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
**Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

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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