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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor of BMC Medical Education

Dr. Blossom Yen-Ju Lin

We greatly appreciate your encouraging e-mail and the reviewer's constructive and positive comments on our manuscript entitled “Prediction of Academic Achievement based on Learning Strategies and Outcome Expectations among Medical Students”. We have now revised the manuscript and explained point-by-point responses to each comment. The changes in the revised manuscript are highlighted in yellow. We hope you find the corrections satisfactory.

Yours sincerely,

Sepideh Hajian

Associate Professor, Department of Midwifery & Reproductive Health, Faculty of Nursing & Midwifery, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the editor and reviewer for positive comments.
Recommendations and responses to the respected reviewers:

Technical Comments:

- No Abstract Heading: this heading has been added after the title and before the Background shows in yellow).

- No Declarations heading: this heading has been added after the abbreviation section and before all declarations (shows in yellow).

Reviewer reports:

Gary Beck Dallaghan, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2): Thank you for completing your thoughtful and comprehensive revision of this manuscript. I only have two items to suggest:

1. Table 1. For Second grade you have 1,668, which I'm assuming is a typographical error. With 380 participants in the study, I assume it should be 168.

Response: Thank you for your attention. It was revised to 168 (shows in yellow in table 1).

2. One of the limitations not mentioned was the non-responders. I realize you were aiming for the requisite amount to achieve appropriate statistical power. However, was there any consideration of comparing the CGPA of those who did not participate with those who did to see if there were differences? It could be that students replied because they were doing well academically and those that did not have struggled. It may be worth mentioning as a limitation of the study if nothing else.

Response: Many thanks for your valuable hint. This limitation has been added at the end of the "Discussion" section before the conclusion (shows in yellow). However, the students who refused to participate in this study were six people and the most important reason was their limited time to response to our questionnaires.

If improvements to the English language within your manuscript have been requested, you should have your manuscript reviewed by someone who is fluent in English. If you would like
professional help in revising this manuscript, you can use any reputable English language editing service. We can recommend our affiliates Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES_BS).

Response: The whole manuscript has been reviewed and checked by a native editor. The editorial certification letter is accessible as an attached file.

Declarations, including: ethics approval and consent to participate, consent to publish, availability of data and materials, competing interests, funding, authors' contributions and acknowledgements were rechecked and organized according to the editorial policies.