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Abstract:

* Would remove "for a more effective feedback."

* I don't understand what "very few students were newly refused to agree with their scores after reviewing video feedback."

Abstract and Introduction

* You define the terms CSA, CPX, and OSCE in the methods in that you state the CPX and OSCE are components of a CSA. I think most people use all three terms interchangeably which makes this confusing.

* I don't quite understand line 15 "students do not always agree with their score." At first I thought, perhaps "students do not feel the score generated from the checklist is an accurate representation of their performance or skill." Having read the article further I am not sure if they disagree with how the checklist was filled out or if the checklist is a fair assessment of their skill.

* The section discussing the different types of feedback is rambling. It could be good if made more concise.

* Line 55 "in the worse scenario a student might lose control." You are starting to get off track from the different types of feedback here and this could be removed.

* Lines 16-28 or so are not clear to a reader that is not familiar with what you do. It is not clear what you used to do and how this new system is different.
* Is the term "first grade medical students" common in other countries. In the US, the term is "first year medical students."

* Can remove "because analyzed data retrospectively" The first sentence regarding IRB is enough

* Why was this not published since 2012? What was the delay. This makes me wonder if this paper has not made it through peer review at many journals.

* The technical aspect of video compression is not of value to the reader

Methods and Results

* It seems students reviewed both sets of videos without faculty involvement. I think this is a good idea but I'm not sure how you verify they watched either video. It could be better described.

* I'm not sure if student agreement with their score or comments is an appropriate outcome.

Overall:

* I think some time could be spent to have someone not familiar with the study read this and work with you to describe what you did to an outsider more clear.

* I very much like the idea of this study but I question the outcome. Some people disagreed more after reviewing the video. I'm not sure agreement of score is equivalent to learning form the experience and if this is the correct marker.

* I think the unique thing you are doing that I would encourage you to follow up with in future scholarship relates to the use of an expert video that students could compare and contrast their performance too

* Future work should look at verifying if students actually watched both sets of videos. Further description with a qualitative focus group study about what they learned maybe of value.
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