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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study describes the creation and evaluation of a 12-month curriculum with definitely proves a lot of work. However, in my opinion there are a few elements that need restructure and rewrite before publishing it. Despite the fact that the authors mention a review from 2013 to identify the gap, in my opinion more evidence should be present in the background section to show that there is need for development such curriculum and that being of a SBL approach.

In the methods section the Authors mention that they are using The Thomas t al's 6 step approach to curriculum development and instructional design principles including the ADDIE approach. There is no justification (line 13, page 4) why the authors focus on need assessments, IS and evaluation and how it draws upon the 6-step approach. The level of description between the three focus points of the authors (assessments, IS and evaluation) have different level of detail. I would suggest the authors to clearly describe their methods and what are the steps that they followed, and how they draw on different theoretical models in order to create them. Maybe a flow chart might be helpful here.

In the results section the Authors start with the steps of the ADDIE process and it is not clear to the reader who expects to see the 6step approach how the two are merged. Maybe a clearer description of methods allow better flow while reading in the Results sections. Do the authors develop a curriculum using an Instructional Strategies approach? Regarding the IS approach, ADDIE, it might worth the trouble to separate Design and Development steps in order to showcase each step of the approach. Page 7 line12 the authors phrase that "the curriculum was chosen based on an estimate 66% attendance rate, allowing learners to be exposed to the curriculum twice during their three-year fellowship" might need clarification - did the authors chosen element from Analysis in order to design the curriculum? What is the relation with the attendance rate on the selection of such curriculum elements. While the example (page 8 lines 1-3) might be understandable from paediatrics and/or in a local context, additional details might help the broad target audience of the journal to better understand it. Even if it is quite common to use case in place of scenario, it might be good the authors to be consistent throughout their manuscript. In Evaluation/Feedback subsection is not clear for me why the authors use the number of critical procedure opportunities per observation and video review as part of the
evaluation(page 10, line 8). Page 11 line 8-9, Is not clear in my opinion hat "consistent with the attendance rates" means in respect with the 21 evaluations.

The discussion section looks more of a summary, instead of actually discussing the results with links to relevant literature. The limitations are well described. in addition, there are some expressions throughout the document, that might worth the trouble, the authors to review and rewrite. For example (page 11, line 21) Effort will be put improving element three - Authors might want to mention the element three in order to allow the text to flow better. Page 10, Line 7 Specific case objectives from end session survey-> Reaching/Meeting Specific case objectives from end session survey. Page 13 line 1 ID abbreviation needs clarification, etc.

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

No

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

Yes

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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