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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Editor and Authors

Thanks for the opportunity that you give me to read the manuscript. I found it interesting but it needs some modifications that I mention them following:

Introduction

1. This is longitudinal descriptive study and the type of study is trend, did not mention.

2. In descriptive - analytical study the hypothesis could not be considered instead of it research question should be mention so I recommend writing research questions instead of hypothesis.

3. The gap of knowledge should be mentioned more precisely.

Method:

1. The type of study which is longitudinal trend study should be mentioned clearly.

2. Some sentences need to edit such as " residents were informed both orally and in writing ?" or Among these 204, 95 (……… It could be stated 95 out of 204 returned the …..

3. The response is lower than 70% however mention about the limitation of generalizability in discussion session but it should mention it in limitation session clearly.

4. The PPOS measure is not contextualize in Japan. It was developed and validated in Western countries so how do you relay on the results of using this tool in your own context because cultural issue is very important on patient and physician attitude regarding communication competency. There is an article regarding difference of communication styles between western and Eastern cultures(1) . Your another tool PCMI correctly was contextualized and there is possibility to use it in Japan but PPOS does not.

5. Due to the use of self-assessment tools the validity of findings is unclear.

6. In participant session there is a need to describe more about non-participant group.

Discussion

1. In first paragraph of discussion the hypothesis should be replaced by research question.

2. There is lots of repetitions of the results instead of this I recommend to put only main findings and then interpretation of the results in comparison with other researchers findings for example which factors may be effect on reducing the patient centered attitude such as gender that was mentioned in manus and why gender is and effective issue (In Japan the faculty gender should be the same as student? Female faculty teach to female students and VS? It looks strange!)

3. Overall the data interpretation is week in this manuscript.

4. The limitation part is integrated with recommendation part as I understand it would be better if the authors consider subtitle for each part regarding cultural issue the author just mentioned few sentences but I believe it should be extended more.

5. Another limitation regarding the few number of observational study in this field should be stated.

Conclusion:

1. Again this part is summary of discussion. it would be more effective if author write about the benefits of considering PPOS in the medical education curriculum and also health policy makers should running specific courses regarding communication skill.

Kind regards
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