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PDF covering letter
Dear Mr. Hodgkinson:

I wish to thank the reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions. I have outlined below a point-by-point description of the changes made in the manuscript.

**Number of Program Participants and Confidence Intervals**
Both reviewers requested that information about the numbers of participants be more explicitly stated. These numbers have now been added to the RESULTS section (page 5, paragraph 2, line 1), as well appearing in TABLE 1 (page 8).

Reviewer 1 requested that our data be presented with confidence intervals, and these have now been provided in TABLE 1.

Reviewer 2 wanted to know how many individuals were invited to participate but declined and why. However, the way in which our program was conducted precluded us from obtaining this information. We simply asked all of the incoming medical students to invite their friends and family members to the event. Whom the students invited, or whether they invited anybody at all, was entirely their choice. In short, the program participants were those who showed up. We have no way of knowing who was invited but didn’t come. This, of course, means that our participants were self-selected, not a random cross-section of all students’ friends and family members. In the METHODS section, we have added a description of the way in which our participants were recruited and the potential bias this creates (page 4, paragraph 2). The reader can then draw his or her own conclusion mindful of this caveat.

**Citations**
Reviewer 2 correctly pointed out that the attribution to Malik was actually referring to the work of others. We have corrected this mistake by referencing the original authors’ work [2, 3] in the BACKGROUND section (page 2, paragraph 2, line 4). The proper attribution to Malik’s work [5] is given on page 3, paragraph 1, line 10.

**Planning Committee**
Reviewer 2 requested that we briefly describe how the planning committee developed the program. This has been added to the METHODS section (page 4, paragraph 1).

**Discretionary Revisions**
The lengths of time facilitating the various aspects of the program have been added (page 4, paragraph 3, line 5). The term OSCE has been replaced by a more descriptive phrase (page 4, paragraph 3, line 3). And the RESULTS and DISCUSSION sections have been separated.

I believe I have adequately satisfied the reviewers concerns and hope that the manuscript is now ready for publication. Please let me know if you need any further modifications.

Sincerely,

, PhD, MPH