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Reviewer's report:

As far as I am concerned, I would have to place this document in the category of "An article of limited interest". It is a review of three learning methods, and there is some discussion regarding them. The summary section, which should contain the main discussion and arguments is far too short I believe. The title speaks of a debate, yet there is little debating in the paper. The Conceptual Framework section which should contain the new theory and the debate regarding the learning theories is also far too short in my opinion.

However, the article is well written and is thoroughly researched, with apt citations and is properly referenced. There are some English errors and therefore these would have to be fixed, such as words with initial capital in the middle of a sentence "... experience, Debriefing with reflexive ..." or the sentence "Therefore, as learner we need....", etc.

Overall I would say for the paper to be published, we would need a more expanded Conceptual Framework section and a more expanded and thorough Summary section.

I would answer the questions as follows:

1. Does the debate present a novel argument, or a novel insight into existing work?
The paper discusses three well known learning theories and discusses their merits.

2. Does the debate address an important problem of interest to a broad biomedical audience?
For the purposes of the Medical Education journal, I believe so.

3. Is the piece well argued and referenced?
The paper is well referenced and researched. The Summary section is too short, as is the section on the conceptual framework.

4. Has the author used logical arguments and sound reasoning?
The arguments are logical, however more debate and discussion is required in both the Conceptual Framework section and the Summary section.
5. Is the piece written well enough for publication?
Needs some slight editing, but otherwise well written and in a good style.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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