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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)

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. I strongly recommend elimination of the Johari Window model from this manuscript. This is confusing, e.g. when on page 3 it is stated that ‘teachers in medical schools in Vietnam have a large blind area’. In the Discussion half a page is wasted on this Johari Window model, which adds nothing to the merits of this study. Moreover, an excellent alternative rationale for the study undertaken is given by reference to the work of Snell et al. (2000).

2. An important question is whether the eight medical schools of Vietnam agreed with publication of the data in connection to their names? The importance of the data would not be reduced if instead the schools were coded by single letters or numbers.

3. Please specify the response rate in the Abstract (i.e., overall 87%; range per school 74-99%).

4. The Conclusion section of the Abstract mentions results not included in the preceding Results section.

5. The first sentence of the third paragraph of the Data collection tool section (page 5: ‘It was not feasible…etc.’) was incomprehensible to me.

6. The last paragraph of the Data collection section (Page 5: ‘Although the method…etc.’) belongs to the Discussion section of the manuscript and hence should be moved.

7. Please insert ‘(CV)’ immediately after mentioning on page 6 ‘coefficient of variation’ (or variance?).

8. In the Results section the wording ‘the vast majority (over 90%)’ is a duplication.
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

In the Background section in two places (page 3 and 4, respectively) different reasons are given for the design of the study. I recommend combining these two sentences in a single paragraph explaining the rationale for the design of this study.

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