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Reviewer's report:

General

Although it is accepted that open questioning styles allows for greater exchange of information, many courses are evaluated by closed questions and Likert scales. In this manuscript, Wahlqvist et al describe and analyse the effects that a more open, student-centred, method of course evaluation had over a five year period. The combination of time-tabled evaluation time and giving the students 2 blank pages implied that a long answer was expected to the single question, thus providing the authors with a large amount of rich data. The analysis and utilisation of this data resulted in effective course evaluation and evolution over the five year period. The manuscript contains a significant amount of work and is generally well constructed.

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

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

When discussing the rationale behind developing a more open evaluation form, the authors quote only one reference [12] to support this move. Are there similar approaches already documented? If so, they should be quoted. In contrast if there are no such evaluation methods previously published (I was unable to find any), then the authors could make a stronger statement of the novelty of this approach. This would strengthen the impact of the paper.

Page 12 Line 3: “Students were challenged by facilitators to new tasks…”. This sentence doesn’t make sense. Should be something like “Students were challenged by facilitators to PERFORM new tasks”

Page 13 Line 10: “…a curriculum reform in 1996 implies reorganization and concentration.” Although this is expanded on a little elsewhere in the manuscript, the statement here is unsupported and would benefit from elaboration with examples.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Page 13 Line 14: “too high an ambition” would read better as “over-ambitious goals”

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:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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