Reviewer’s report

Title: Effects of participation in a cross year peer tutoring programme in clinical examination skills on volunteer tutors skills and attitudes towards teachers and teaching.

Version: 3  Date: 20 May 2007

Reviewer: Dejano T. Sobral

Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors made substantial improvements in their revised work both in content and presentation. Notwithstanding the limitations of the study, the article seems to me a useful contribution to our growing knowledge of the conditions, benefits and restrictions of the peer tutoring experience in medical education.

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)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
1. In the discussion section, third paragraph, the proper allusion to reference [10] should be: “This reflects the findings of similar studies in preclinical and clinical contexts [10].

2. The subheadings (explanatory notes) for similar figures [e.g., 1(a), 1(b)] should be uniform in content.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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