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Reviewer’s report:

Abstract Line 33; results should have mean of satisfaction score

Line 37 Conclusion: the authors demonstrated satisfaction but did not demonstrate “how it might contribute to improve patient safety…”. Conclusion are over-reaching.

Background: line 70: The authors says “recent reports from European…” but yet the article they site is from 1999. I’m not sure there is really literature arguing that students performing procedures causes “psychological damage”. The usual arguments are ethical issues of consent.

Methods Line 135: I see nothing of OSCE in what they describe as OSCE. “They were assessed by themselves whether they were confident enough….” This is not clear. I think the authors mean that the residents judged each other on the skill using a checklist. That process does not make it and OSCE. OSCE are standardized and structured. The suse of a checklist does not make it right.

Line 150 “the questions and the …” refers to results not methods.

Results line 159/ figure 2. The figure with results of survey questions does not have clear legend and is not interpretable.

Line 161. Results of survey reported to 0.02 decimal is detail not supported by the research.

Line 163: the survey did not ask questions of did the participant “ appreciated [the ability of the model] to simulate the psychological and emotional experiences of their patient.”

Conclusions, Line 189: over-reaching. The study did not “confirm educational effects….”. It showed only that learners were satisfied.

Conclusions: line 227: Again over-reaching. The study only shows satisfaction not educational effect.

Numerous Grammatical mistakes, will need to proofed by editor

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have
responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**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.
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