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Author’s response to reviews:

Mr. Sören Huwendiek
Editor
BMC Medical Education

Dear Editor:

We sincerely appreciate your insightful suggestions. We have revised our manuscript titled, “Effects on postgraduate-year-I residents of simulation-based learning compared to traditional lecture-style education led by postgraduate-year-II residents: A pilot study.” The answers to all your comments are listed below. In addition, our manuscript was checked and edited by Editage (www.editage.jp) again to write a comprehensive one.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Akira Yamamoto
Mikako Obika

1. Abstract methods: be clear for which methods you used also pre and post tests (at the moment you might envision you did this for all..).

Response 1: Thank you for pointing this out. We have changed the sentence so as to ensure that there is no misunderstanding that pre- and post-tests were used for self-evaluation nor program evaluation (Pre- and post-tests were used only for knowledge-evaluation).

Please refer to lines 67–68 on page 4.

2. Abstract results: "Test scores" must be clearly defined. Do you mean "knowledge test scores" then you should also write that.

Response 2: Thank you for identifying this point. We added “knowledge” to the corresponding parts. Please refer to line 69 on page 5.

3. Writing also just "self-evaluation..." is not clear enough. Self-evaluation of what?

Response 3: Thank you for this comment. We have now described the classification of self-evaluation clearly. Please refer to lines 71–72 on page 5.

4. Further the conclusion of the abstract needs improvement. Your research question is to compare lecture with simulation and then you talk only about the simulation. This should be better aligned so that you also address this comparison in the conclusion. Please improve this also in the conclusion of the discussion part of the main text.

Response 4: Thank you for this pertinent comment. We have modified the sentences to provide a comprehensive explanation of simulation-based learning effects compared to the lecture. Please refer to lines 75–76 on page 5, lines 239–240 on page 15, lines 306–310 on page 19, and lines 355–357 on page 21–22.

5. Further, as you admit yourself in the paper the study is preliminary. Therefore, please put at the end of the title....": a pilot study".

Response 5: We agree with your suggestion. We have changed the title from “Effects on postgraduate-year-I residents of simulation-based learning compared to traditional lecture-style education led by postgraduate-year-II residents” to “Effects on postgraduate-year-I residents of simulation-based learning compared to traditional lecture-style education led by postgraduate-year-II residents: A pilot study” because this study is a preliminary one.
Please refer to line 2 on page 1.

6. Please submit your revised manuscript as a single clean copy without any tracked changes, colored or highlighted text. You may provide the manuscript with tracked changes or highlighting as a supplementary file.

Response 6: We prepared our revised manuscript as a single clean copy and provided manuscript with tracked changes or highlighting as a supplementary file.

7. Please state clearly the role the funder(s) had in your study in the "funding" section of the declarations.

Response 7: Thank you for your comments. We added the role of the funder clearly.

Please refer to line 375–376 on page 23–24.

8. The individual contributions of ALL authors to the manuscript should be specified in this section.

Response 8: Thank you for your comments. We fixed the authors’ role clearly.

Please refer to line 379–386 on page 24.

9. Move the Abbreviations after References.

Response 9: We moved the Abbreviations after References.

Please refer to line 443–444 on page 28.