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Reviewer's report:

General

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

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

The authors responded to my raised questions in the first review sufficiently. Nevertheless I would like statistical review by a statistician.

Regarding the content, I still have one problem. The authors compare the perceptions of students with the perceptions of colleagues, and conclude that using students perception as evaluation tool is not appropriate. In my view this is one bridge too far. Please skip this conclusion. The paper is fine, just comparing both and telling that there is no significant connection. Maybe a connection between those two perceptions is not even necessary. I can image that my view as college is different because the behaviour of my college towards me is different of his behaviour towards students.

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

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

In the introduction the authors mention 'personality'. I would replace that by role model or characteristics, which is more the real meaning within this paragraph.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.