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Reviewer's report:

General

The authors have responded effectively to nearly all my comments and suggestions. The cover letter was precise, complete, and accurate in helping me find the edits.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Nearly all comments addressed well. Two exceptions important enough to mention:

1. Reviewer comment 1b (roles of faculty in developing curriculum):

   The term "lead faculty remains ambiguous in the text. At various points it sounds like one faculty (who did the needs assessment interviews - last line p. 5), two faculty (who discussed the results of the needs assessment and designed the intervention - first para under "Curriculum Design" p 6), and could be inferred to include the entire faculty group. Since I suspect "lead faculty" refers to the two authors throughout, this should be stated explicitly.

   The reference to the two lead faculty being "tasked" and having requirements to report objective improvement is enlightening and intriguing. It provides important context, relating to generalizability. Please state WHO the mysterious "tasker" was (e.g., the Dean).

2. Reviewer Comment 3 (How were were data gathered):

   The information is now in the text, but belongs in Methods not Results.

All remaining revisions address the comments and suggestions well.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

I like the final balance drawn by the authors re: statistical issues in a small study.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

One minor comment: The paper reports an exploratory study (small sample and limited measures limiting generalizability and validity), not an exploratory analysis (preliminary analysis of large
dataset - implies more analysis is forthcoming).

"Exploratory analysis" is used in the abstract and discussion sections.

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No
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