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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

Thanks again for your confidence when adding my suggestions after the review. Methodological improvement is well noticed in the new version, also after taking to account the accurate recommendations of our colleagues which were more concise in statistical assessment.

There are still some few typographical errors in the manuscript (Introduction, above all).

I think the description of the Post Hoc Power Analysis could be better added to the Methods and just mention it in the Results section.

The discussion has improved significantly, and now it is much better understood the purpose of the study, and better illustrated. So the conclusion meets the ultimate goal of improving the quality of medical education in Anesthesiology.

The bibliography and the tables are clear and well organized, with better format after the revision. There is just one mistake in the Figure legends: Figure 3 description is missing and then there must be corrected in the right order, because a picture was included and now they must be reordered.

In my opinion, the Appendix 1-2 will be appended to the text as long as the editor complies. They are merely descriptive and could be obviated without subtracting information from the manuscript as they are supplementary material. In case they could be added, their names need to be attached to the tables. Appendix 1 name is missing.

I still think that this work could emphasize more its usefulness to improve the quality of teaching of residents based on competences and not be so focused so much on the methodology of the validation of an assessment device which is not widespread or within reach of all training centers. Anyway, it brings a kind of interesting novelty and it is well done. So in my opinion, after all the revisions, it could be published.

Thank you ver much and best regards.
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