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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting paper describing the development of an evaluation tool for lectures in medicine. The importance of feedback to teachers for the enhancement of students' learning has received increasing attention. Standardized and validated instruments are preferable to locally developed questionnaires and this paper presents the development of such an instrument.

The study is well designed and performed and I only have a few comments.

My comments are:

Page 5. I wonder why students were not involved in the development of the instrument items. Since the students are the ones who will answer the questionnaires it is important how they interpret the items and how they judge their relevance. I believe this is a weakness of the study that should be discussed in the paper.

On page 4 a pilot test with 898 students is mentioned and on page 7 246 students completing the FEVOR. However, the collection of data for studies 1 and 2 are not mentioned in the Methods section. This is somewhat confusing and I suggest that they should be included. A description of how the instruments were distributed should also be included - paper at the end of lectures, electronic survey etc?

Page 6, line 27 states that the questionnaire version was subjected to cognitive debriefing, but it is not described how. An addition of this information is needed.

In the results section pages 10-12 the results concerning how many students completed the questionnaires are described. But it is not mentioned how they may reflect the total student population. I understand that this is difficult but an indication of the response rate and whether e.g the gender distribution matched the total population could be included.

Page 14, line 10, would not lecturer be better word than tutor here? A tutor is usually associated with small group learning.

Page 15 line 24 etc, the item about appropriate workload is interesting when the lecturer wants to use the results for development of the lecture. It the grading of this item is low, is the workload too high or too low? This could be discussed.
Finally I would also like to see a discussion on the future use of the instrument. If it has been developed for formative use and not mainly summative, the consequences of its use are a very important aspect of the validity. How do the lecturers react to and interpret the results? Do they know what to do if the scores are not entirely positive? See e. g. Cook DA, Beckman TJ. Current concepts in validity and reliability for psychometric instruments: theory and application. Am J Med. 2006 Feb;119(2):166.e7-16.

There are some minor issues with the English, especially in the introduction (lines 19, 54, 59).
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