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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

First of all well done on this body of work which is important to publish and is relevant to other countries.

In the abstract first sentence you state "Traditional medical education has emphasized passive learning" Does this apply to Nepal? I was unclear regarding this.

In the methods section you talk about "Mid Level providers" and after reading your manuscript several times I am unclear what they do. You provide a description in the introduction regarding qualification but please can you explain to the reader what does a mid level provider do in a hospital which will then be relevant for their educational requirements. What is their role and what education do they need to provide this role. Do they care of patients, prescribe, what do they do?

In the methods section you use the word traditional didactics, please can you clarify what is meant by this? I would also remove the work understandability, and use another word, what does this word mean in this context?
In the methods you talk about mid level providers, again what do they do?

Please can you expand on lecture audits in the methods and results section. I did not understand how exactly audits were carried out after reading the manuscript, did both SM and LW time these audits and what was the level of agreement between them?

In the methods section, under educational strategies, the last sentence is unclear how you came to this conclusion, can you expand on how individuals were asked to prepare and deliver the lectures. Were they given a guide regarding how to do this or educational resources to do this?

Under evaluation and feedback Exam results were stratified by level of training and system blocks, to allow for internal evaluation. Please can you explain this? I don't understand this.

Please explain how lecture audits were performed using real time by two clinicians, I was unsure how you did this after reading the paper.

In the discussion section

Immediate feedback came through lecture audit results, lecture evaluation and verbal discussion, please explain did this occur in front of the class or was this one to one feedback.

In the discussion section under limitations you talk about learner talk time is a crude marker, please expand on what constituted talk time and did the class participants know this was an evaluation that was being carried out by SM or LW, was the teacher or the participants blinded?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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