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Author's response to reviews:

Dear editor;

First, I would like to thank for your kind interest with our article titled "Comparison Of Knowledge Scores Of Medical Students In Problem-Based Learning And Traditional Curriculum On Public Health Topics". Regarding the comments of two reviewers we have made some amendments in the article as listed below:

Reviewer 1. J F Arocha
Major compulsory revisions
1. This is your decision if the article must be evaluated as a literature review or research article. We will accept any of them.
2. We have underlined the differences between traditional and problem based education curricula more in introduction section.
3. The statement of the reviewer was totally accepted and implemented into conclusion section.
4. We have discussed the use of F test with an experienced statistician and concluded that t test is more convenient. Therefore we did not change the statistical methods.
5. We have provided some sample questions representing the topics of public health in the appendix.

Minor essentially revisions

1. The word "levels" was excluded from the title and the text. The other corrections recommended by the reviewer were performed in page 8 and 11.

Reviewer 2. Michele Groves
Major compulsory revisions
None

Minor essentially revisions

1. A brief description of the differences between traditional and problem based curricula was implemented into introduction section.
2. The first four paragraphs of the conclusion of the old manuscript were moved to introduction section regarding the recommendation of the reviewer.
3. The first sentence of the results section was clarified.
4. We added following statement to the conclusion section regarding the reviewer’s comment: "Actually special learning opportunities were provided for all topics and we were expecting to find a difference on remaining 7 topics too".
5. The first table of the old manuscript was ignored and only one table stayed in the new manuscript.

On this occasion I would like to send my best wishes of mary christmas and happy new year
Sincerely yours

Dr. Erol Gurpinar