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High-fidelity is not superior to low-fidelity simulation but leads to overconfidence in medical students (MEED-D-18-00897)

Knowledge & performance similar but overconfidence in high-fidelity group.

Very good study. Well written and commendable. Kindly find my comments/questions below:

Methods:

1. Why 4th year students alone? Could their year of study affect assimilation/knowledge/skills? This can be added to the study limitations if the year of study could affect the results.

2. Why misinform the participants about the study purpose? Was it really necessary?

3. Confidence was self-rated and those exposed to HF may naturally rate themselves higher. It may be better to use more objective tools to assess confidence in future studies.

Results:

Ventilation without equipment (29 vs 41%) and placement of venous cannula (26 vs 39%) were much better in the HF group.

Could these have been significant if analyzed differently? Was there nothing the HF group could do better?
Conclusion:

Although your study showed non-superiority of HF, science is dynamic and we must continuously seek improvements.

Moving ahead, although not part of your study, are there areas of HF simulation you identified that if improved will lead to better performance? Could these be included as recommendations?

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.

Yes

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

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable
Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal