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Manuscript (second draft)
A randomized-controlled trial of two educational modes for undergraduate evidence-based medicine teaching and learning in Asia.

In general the second version of this article is much better than the previous one. The authors used the feedback very carefully and added useful and relevant information in the text.

In this version it is clear to understand what the authors mean by the terms of EBM and the other educational mode (the usual way of teaching). Also the context of the research question is more clear. Furthermore the authors added necessary information about the focus groups (methods and results) and the way of analyzing the data. The students comments are illustrative.

However, there are two comments that still need extra attention:

1. In the detailed response to the reviewers the authors gave background information about the starting point for the focus groups (questions and topics used in the focus groups). The authors mentioned that questions were drawn from literature and past experience in this research area. I would suggest adding some of these questions to the article.

2. The authors agree that the non-response rate (for the focus groups) was rather high. I understand why (a lot of ) students were not able to participate in the group session. I am not convinced that the results of the focus groups would be the exactly the same if the response rate was higher. Are the responders and the non-responders comparable? It would be useful if the authors could add some information about this.
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