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Reviewer's report:

General

The revised paper is an improved version of the previous paper describing student attitudes towards a cultural competency curriculum. I have a number of concerns which I detail below. Generally, while the research presented is interesting and important, the paper is overly long and complex. The paper would be greatly improved by focusing on a few findings from the focus groups. I recommend the "spontaneously" emergent categories mentioned on p. 14 as these seem the most interesting and well-supported findings. I think a paper revised along these lines could (in 3500 words or less) accurately describe your findings and inform the emerging field of cultural competency education research.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

The introduction could be significantly shortened without eliminating the new references by summarizing findings across multiple studies in a single sentence.

The results section is too long. I suggest focusing on the concepts that emerged from the data and leaving off the description of responses to the interview schedule. This is what I was referring to in my previous comments about not carrying through the 4 points mentioned at the end of the introduction. I suggest rewriting the final paragraph of the introduction to set up the emergent themes and then focusing the results section on those themes. The data presented with regard to the emergent themes is rich and convincing. The summaries of responses given for the interview schedule are overly broad and should be eliminated.

The discussion is confusing and overly long. This section still includes much in the way of new results, for example on p. 18, the authors mention that "one student proposed that ... we should focus on negotiating skills." This information does not appear in the results section and it is unclear why a reference is included following this summary of a new result. There are many more such instances in this section.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

The use of the term "theoretical triangulation" is an unusual one. The typical use of the term is to describe the use of multiple methods to collect data about a single phenomenon thus providing a number of different perspectives and therefore increasing the confidence with which one can view the findings. The authors seem to be referring rather to the strengths inherent in a multi-disciplinary research team.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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