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Reviewer’s report:

This is a report of using a method for CBL that involves a discussant blinded to the diagnosis demonstrating how they might handle the case with an audience of 40-50 pre-clinical students with the goal of helping students understand the step-by-step approach to diagnosis and management. The authors suggest that hindsight bias interferes with the uncertainty of CBL. They have used self-report of cognitive skills as a measure.

Strengths: This is a well-written paper that explains clearly the rationale for the approach and the methods used to evaluate the innovation. The abstract reflects the paper and the references are appropriate. The approach may be useful as we struggle to find enough tutors for small groups.

Suggestions: The authors rightly identify the limitations of the report. Self-report does not accurately reflect skills and the low response rates may suggest bias in reporting. It would be helpful to describe the alternative learning of the convenience control group. As this was an elective course, how were the students different from the other groups who did not participate?

I would question how well the students become active learners in these large groups despite the attempt at interaction. With 1 hour sessions of 40-50 participants and both the discussant and facilitator, for many this may serve as a demonstration. That said this may be justified by the cost of smaller groups. As this is an additional learning opportunity, could that be the effect?

Early students typically are uncomfortable with uncertainty and become more comfortable as the knowledge base grows. It might be useful to examine this aspect with qualitative review.

Finally, does this course lead to better outcomes post-clerkship or will this be attenuated by the other experiences of the clinical students?

Abstract: Might read: During the 2016 course iteration, a quasi-experimental study compared self-reported clinical skills between 29 course participants.

Conclusion: "Prospective case-based discussions are effective in teaching cognitive reasoning skills " is not supported by the paper, only by self-report.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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**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?**
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