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Dear Editor,

Thank you for the comments from your reviewer on our manuscript entitled ‘Assessment of an electronic voting system within the tutorial setting. A randomised trial.

Our replies are set out below.

Major Revisions
We accept the reviewer’s comments regarding the randomisation of groups in our study. To verify that the groups were stratified and randomised correctly we carried out a one-way ANOVA on the data, looking for differences due to gender or academic ability. We found none.

To indicate this in our manuscript, we have added the following.

In METHODS
The randomisation was carried out by the secretariat in the medical school, who had no connection with the study. In order to verify that this randomisation had been carried out effectively, a one-way ANOVA was used to look for differences between groups in the areas of gender and academic ability. Academic ability was measured using the previous years exam results.

In RESULTS
In the six groups, there were a total of 102 students. 99 students completed the questionnaire and 86 completed all three elements of the pre- and post- testing. The groups were statistically identical with regard to gender (p=0.92) and academic ability (p=0.54) as indicated by one-way ANOVA.

We feel that this makes the quality of the stratification of our groups clear.

Thank you once again for the consideration of our paper.

Yours sincerely
Edward Palmer, Peter Devitt, David Morris, Neville DeYoung