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Thank you for the opportunity to peer review the manuscript titled "Do Senior Medical Students Meet Recommended Emergency Medicine Curricula Requirements".

This study aimed to evaluate the breadth (patient presentations and procedures) and depth (level of involvement) of clinical experience during a 4-week emergency medicine (EM) clerkship at two hospitals in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) over a period of one year.

It is a well written study and provides information relating to the range of presentations encountered and procedures performed by students in a setting where there have been few studies.

The breadth of clinical experience during an EM clerkship is context specific and dependent on a variety of factors, including case mix and acuity of patient presentations. Therefore, it is not unexpected that there will be both similarities and differences in range of presentations encountered by students in this study compared with previously published studies.

A strength of this study is the rigorous collection of the range of presentations encountered and procedures performed by students and identifying the gaps in clinical experience. The findings in this study may help those involved in developing EM curricula in similar contexts.

However, the manuscript would benefit from addressing the following comments:

1. It is unclear to this reviewer how a patient presentation would be classified if the patient presentation fell into two categories. For example, in a patient presenting with chest pain who deteriorates into cardiac arrest, how would this patient be classified? Similarly, almost 60% of the presentations fell into the "other chief complaints" category. Could the authors please elaborate on the potential for and the extent of measurement error because of incorrectly categorising the presentation.
2. It would be interesting to know whether there is a relationship between the range of presentations encountered by the student and case mix for each ED. This may provide some insight as to whether a presentation is uncommon for a specific ED or simply a lack of opportunity for students to encounter these presentations despite being a relatively common presentation, the former of which has important implications for curricular development.

3. Please could the authors elaborate on the definition of student involvement. Does level of involvement relate to both patient presentation and procedures performed? The definition of level of involvement is not clear to this reviewer from reading the manuscript. For example, does full involvement for a procedure mean the student can perform the specified procedure with minimal supervision/independently?

4. It is unclear from the manuscript the level of involvement to be attained by the student for a specific presentation or procedure at the completion of the ED clerkship. Does this vary between the different presentations encountered and procedures?

5. Please could the authors elaborate on whether the student's lack of clinical experience in specific presentations encountered or performing specific procedures affected their performance in clerkship assessments.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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