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Reviewer's report:

Thank you much for getting the opportunity to review the manuscript on the "Need for ensuring cultural competence in medical programmes of European universities". This is a relevant theme in medical education and thus awareness should be raised. However, this manuscript represents a snapshot as the questionnaire was sent to 12 partner universities within a EU-project and answered only by these 12 institutions. Therefore, whenever stating that "over the half" or "almost none" (e.g. abstract, but has to be changed throughout the entire manuscript!) this has to be changed into "over half of the participants in our study…” etc.

Moreover, the study objective is given as: "To gain a deeper insight into how CC is prioritised on an institutional level at medical schools in Europe, this paper investigates the level of cultural competence in European university medical education programmes." which seems to be largely overrating the potential this study has. By asking 4 percent of the medical institutions it is clearly not possible to gain a deeper insight and to investigate the level of cultural competence…

I would suggest to say: "This study gives a snapshot of the level of cultural competence…”

I do think that this study points to major deficiencies, but the authors have to limit their conclusions more to possible deficiencies as they only asked 12 institutions and it remains totally unclear what others might have to say to this topic.

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.

No

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
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