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Reviewer's report:

General
1. p8, number of physicians originally invited should be reported.
2. The statistical procedures used to analyze the data need to be explicitly stated. This is especially true in the last paragraph on page 12 comparing the attitudes for 3 groups (original study specialists, original study non-specialists, random sample specialists) and the last paragraph on page 13 in which the differences between specialists and non-specialists in the production of correct diagnoses are compared.
3. In table 2, the distribution of the original study group and random sample group seem to be different in the Converging and Diverging categories. Some discussion of the implication of this would be useful. It might be beneficial to report how the subgroups of specialists and non-specialists distributed themselves among the various learning style categories to potentially clarify the situation.
4. Since most readers will be unfamiliar with the categories of learning style purporting to be identified by the Kolb Learning Style Inventory, it would be helpful to spend a little more time explaining what the four categories of learning style mean.

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)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes
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