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Reviewer's report:

General
This manuscript describes a study of the use of early clinical exposure (ECE) as a tool in enriching the endocrine physiology curriculum offerings to medical students. Students received traditional lectures supplemented by case-based lectures, and then were provided access in groups to patients with established endocrine disorders. The the students' opinions of the value of the clinical exposure was assessed. 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.

Comments for improvement: the many student quotes are distracting, and the quantitative data limited as presented. The authors should use more quantitative data in describing the results, ex. p 3 "many students felt ECE...helped remember things better" How many? Also, perhaps there is a better way to organize the quotes from the qualitative approach (ex. list quotes in accompanying tables, rather then including all of them in the text.

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   Not necessarily new, but nice study.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   Yes
3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   See above.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   OK
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   I don't seem to have access to the title page and abstract.
7. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes

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)