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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript titled 'Impact of video feedback system on medical students' perception of their clinical skills assessment". Given the increasing emphasis on feedback, this study has the potential to be of interest to a wide audience. I have a number of comments which if addressed would strengthen the manuscript.

The focus of this manuscript is solely on feedback but there is a small literature on the use of videos in OSCEs, which is relevant to this manuscript. I have listed some articles below. Note that this is not an exhaustive list but the author(s) should review some of them and include those that are relevant in their introduction.


I found the purpose of the study to be a bit weak. Rather than looking for improvements in performance given this feedback system, or study how the stakeholders use the information from the feedback system, or even compare different feedback systems, the purpose of the study was only to see if people agreed with the results. Perhaps the author(s) could better emphasize in the introduction why this is an important question to ask, and in the discussion provide some next steps they would implement to test out the benefits of this feedback system.

On page 5, the information on how the questionnaire was developed is a sparse. What kind of relevant literature was reviewed, what kind of consensus was used. Why was a rating scale used given that all the questions in table 1 are really just yes/no questions. This does not need to have a large amount of text but a bit more detail is needed.

On page 6, there is mention of a pass/fail standard being applied. How was the pass/fail standard determined and how many people failed. Similar to the point above, this does not need to have a large amount of text but a bit more detail is needed.

On page 7 there is mention of an ANOVA with the result displayed in figure 2. The problem is that I am not clear on what question was actually analyzed. Please clarify. Also on page 7 the author state that p-values between .05 and .10 will be labelled as marginally significant. Effects are either significant or not, there is no such thing as marginally significant. The author(s) may wish to use a more lenient p-value of .10 to declare significance but if so then they need to build a case for why they wish to do so. Personally, I would not do this but I suppose the authors could make a case for it. Finally, there are big issues around how to interpret p-values, and with 103 people relatively small differences will be statistically significant. I would suggest the authors report the effect sizes associated with all p-values to help the reader understand which questions are actually different and which are different just because there are so many people.
It was not clear to me until the discussion that the learners received a video of themselves along with the video of the highest performing learners. Up to that point, it seemed like learners only got the videos of the highest performer. Please ensure the methods are clear that this was the manipulation that was used.

For table 1, the order of the adjectives listed on page 6 and 7 are reverse of those listed in Table 1. Please correct. For the table perhaps add point on the scale corresponds to a 1, what corresponds to a 2 etc. Also specify that the table contains means and presumably standard deviations. I also wonder about the distributions. Based on table 2 and 3 it looks like hardly any 1's and 2's were chosen so these are highly skewed distributions ranging from 3-5. At this point, I start to wonder how much the scale is actually of value when distributions are so tight. Perhaps the authors could speak to the skewed distributions and why they provide useful information.

Figure 2. I wonder if a figure is needed. Typically, production of figures is more costly than tables. That said, if a figure is used, please ensure the title, which labels the conditions by number, matches the actual figure, which labels conditions by letter. Also, what do the error bars represent? I also want effect sizes because looking at this figure, there is huge overlap in the error bars which leads me to think these are very small effects.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**  
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