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Dear Editor,

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript MS: 1017870941268933 “Attitude of medical students towards Early Clinical Exposure in learning endocrine physiology: a qualitative analysis”. Herewith I provide a point to point response to the reviewer’s report.

Regards
Solomon Sathishkumar

Reviewer's report

Title: Attitude of medical students towards Early Clinical Exposure in learning endocrine physiology: a qualitative analysis.
Version: 1 Date: 28 March 2007
Reviewer: Marian Walters

Reviewer's report:

General:
1. “……In general, the study is useful in providing data about the value to the students of the ECE exercise, as well as defining some pitfalls”.
Response: Thank you.

Comments for improvement:

1. “The authors should use more quantitative data in describing the results, ex. p 3 ”many students felt ECE…helped remember things better” How many?”
Response: This has been corrected. Now the sentence reads as “…10 students felt that ECE not only contributed towards acquiring knowledge but also helped to remember things better”. All the other results have quantitative data.

2. “The many student quotes are distracting…..perhaps there is a better way to organize the quotes from the qualitative approach (ex. list quotes in accompanying tables, rather than including all of them in the text.)”
Response: This has been done. The quotes have been organized in a single table.

Major Compulsory Revisions: None

Minor Essential Revisions: None mentioned here
General:
1. “Because the authors describe a novel application of early clinical experiences the manuscript is worthy of consideration of publication with appropriate revisions perhaps in the “debate” category”.
Response: The manuscript has been resubmitted in the debate category with appropriate revisions.

2. “worthy of consideration of publication with appropriate revisions perhaps in the “debate” category. Such an article would present the pros and cons of the various methodologies described in the background section as alternative approaches to reinforcing didactic instruction and go on to present their description of the early clinical experience in endocrinology as well as student reactions to it as an alternative approach worthy of consideration”.
Response: As suggested, we have described (in the discussion section) the pros and cons of the various methodologies mentioned in the background section as alternative approaches to reinforcing didactic instruction in endocrine physiology. The various methodologies are case stimulated learning, problem based learning and patient-centered learning. We have also described another methodology called multiple format sessions. As suggested, we have then gone on to describe the early clinical exposure program in endocrinology as well as student reactions to it, as an alternative approach worthy of consideration (in the discussion section).

Major Compulsory Revisions:
“Modify manuscript as described in the general comments so that it conforms to a “debate” format”.
Response: The manuscript has been modified as described in the general comments to conform to the debate format. Abstract consists of background, discussion and summary. This is followed by background, discussion and summary. We have also modified/shortened the title from “Attitude of medical students towards Early Clinical Exposure in learning endocrine physiology: a qualitative analysis” to “Attitude of medical students towards Early Clinical Exposure in learning endocrine physiology”.

Minor Essential Revisions: None mentioned here

**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

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests.
Regards
Yours sincerely
Solomon Sathishkumar