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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the manuscript. A few thoughts primarily on the methods. You mention the increase in test scores from pre to post curricular. Please clarify if you used the same pre-test as the post-test and note this as a limitation if so. Also, if I'm understanding your methodology, the pre-test and post-tests were given before intervention and after the intervention. If that's the case, then the increase in test scores might have been from your learners simply going through a curriculum in general, not because of your intervention. It's then challenging to interpret if it's really your intervention that created the score lift. Did you assess pre-test/post-test on the previous curriculum? This could have served as a control for your intervention.

Also, You mention that "Nepali and U.S. physicians developed the multiple choice questions to ensure relevance, validity and readability." How did you do this? Did you pilot test to ensure readability? How did you derive the content? Why 33 questions? What framework for "validity" are you referring to?

Lastly, although you state that you included response rate on your surveys, I'm still struggling to find where this is in your results. Perhaps label this clearly in the results section as, "total survey response rate was n."

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.

No

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:
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