Reviewer's report

Title: A randomized controlled study to determine the difference in the quality of scientific writing under standard writing and online writing groups

Version: 2 Date: 14 December 2008

Reviewer: Jorge G Ruiz

Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed many of my comments. However, I still have a couple of observations.

1. On page 11, 1st paragraph: “Focus group discussions were transcribed using Conventional Qualitative Analysis techniques and the results of this study have been reported elsewhere (37).” I think this is a mistake. It reads as if they reported the detailed description of the qualitative methodology from their study in an article published in 1998! They must clarify to mean that for a more detailed description of qualitative methods please refer to (37). It is possible that the authors made a mistake in the reference number.

2. On page 20, conclusion is overstated: “Our study suggests that online courses are generally superior to traditional scientific writing classes” I think they cannot make that assertion based on the results of their study. They can only conclude that their online module was superior to their traditional approach.
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