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This study demonstrated that final year medical students encountered less patient presentations and procedures than those recommended by the authors' clerkship curriculum.

Major issues

* The study is reasonably designed. From what I can tell- the students not aware of the types of patient presentations they needed to see (meaning the 10 core presentations)

The major issue with methods is that students did not know what core presentations they should be seeing. They were not guided to assist their own learning. Thus, If students were not instructed to indicate the core 10 presentations, they may not have directly indicated that. For example, chief complaint might have been leg swelling (from congestive heart failure) and Shortness of breath been a secondary complaint and thus not listed. Not sure the authors/faculty indicated what patient presentations were expected to be seen.

* Based on the discussion, I am not sure what this article contributes to the literature. If "Avegno et al. reported that about 15% of students examined all recommended presentations of the CDEM curriculum during their EM clerkship (9)." How is this study different? Or different from Mcgraw and Lord. This is mostly described in the discussion. The similarities and differences area not particularly meaningful. If the authors think there are real differences, they need to state the why it matters.

Authors note "A strength of this study is its facilitation of recognition of deficient curricular areas needing to be addressed." This is making a broader assumption that the only methods of
learning is to observe or participate patient care in order to learn. I am not sure that this is supported. Many EM residents will never see some rare diagnosis but yet they are still expected to be able to identify and manage these rare things. So the paper needs to clarify their understanding of Em learning. Is case based learning adequate? does exposure to the content through classroom, or simulation, etc meet the measure for learning? Is the argument they should be making that if these are core topics that are not learned via patients thye need to be learned through alternative methods.

* Exposure to these patients does not assure learning- limitation

Minor issues

* Abstract needs to include the context including the country of origin

* Please rephrase "validated EM curricula." Possible to collect validity evidence surrounding curriculum in a context.

* Numbers are not clear- it says the mandate was that student should log minimum of 45 patients and perform 50 procedures. Then--First the paper says- 68.3 (17.6) patients and 46.1 (14.0) procedures. Then " number of patients seen was 28.9"

* Methods are not clear- assumptions are made, when the log books were entered. Assume they were categorized into the categories of patient presentations of interest. It is only in a footnote of the tables is it noted that the authors included non-CDEM diagnoses due to local input. It is reasonable to add additional, but needs at least a short discussion of why, whose input, etc. Further it is difficult in results to determine when the authors note percent whether it is the pure CDEM list or the broader list. Construct validity is better met by keeping to the CDEM list

* Paper needs to clarify their understanding of Em learning. Is case based learning adequate, does exposure to the content through classroom, or simulation, etc meet the measure for learning.

* Not sure why the authors report weekly- it is either by month or by shift -" Our study has shown that students examined an average of 17 patients and were involved with 12 procedures weekly.

* Discussion mentions CDEm and ACEP curriculum. But readers do not know the differences between them.
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