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Reviewer’s report:

General:
The effort to understand barriers to geriatrics education in this particular region is laudable and one that should continue. The title and abstract do reflect the intent of the study.

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

Methods:
1) I would like to see a Table 1 that comments on the demographics of the participants in the project. It would be helpful if you mentioned if this data had been gathered in the course of the survey as information of this type can be useful to those who would like to see if the study applies to their own population.

2) There is not enough detail about the study to replicate it. You don't indicate how the survey was done: mail, email, group meeting. What was the response rate? For the interview: who did the interviewing? Were the responses audiotaped or videotaped? Who coded the responses and how was consensus reached when there was disagreement?

3) The area of "theoretical concepts" is still unclear after several reviews. You talk about theoretical concerns as being a major area of concern but in neither the table nor the body of the paper is it clear what this term means. In general, for Table 1, each of the terms needs to be better defined in the body of the paper so that anyone who reads the paper will be clear about the authors' intents for these categories.

4) Translating a paper into another language is really challenging work. However, the lower quality of the translation of this paper is very distracting to the reader and takes away from the content. Sentences are long and complicated and there are so many grammar errors that it is very distracting. I would have another translator or fluent English-speaker look at this more carefully.

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

1) By the term transversal, do you mean cross-sectional study?
2) I would consider using more quotes, particularly from students. This makes your narrative much richer, more descriptive and can illustrate your points more effectively. In Table 4 it would be helpful to identify who said the quotes (teacher or student) and at what level for example the student is.

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 whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
Statistical review: No
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