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Reviewer’s report:

General
This study is hard to comment on because statistical methods have been used which are extremely hard to interpret when the actual questions used are not given to us. the discussion is also less than helpful as it is complex and so tied up with (a)s (b)s etc and the concentration on reading law cases rather than engaging in genuine ethical education. I therefore think that the paper could be vastly improved by taking the emphasis off the statistical correlations and focusing more on the material discussed on pages 9-11. There is no attempt to define key terms like "three-dimensional learning environment" but the conclusions seem to be sound in terms of traditional thinking about ethics education in the Western context and perhaps the author ought to do some background reading in, for instance, the Journal of Medical Ethics

-----------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
making the methods and statistics more comprehensible and relating them more closely to the discussion.and

-----------------------------------------------

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)

-----------------------------------------------

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 importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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