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Reviewer's report:

The authors have gone a considerable way towards meeting the issues raised by the reviewers. In particular the numbers of students involved in the study and the differentiation between cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses and results are now far clearer. My only criticisms relate to the Abstract, Strengths and Limitation and Conclusions.

Abstract: Given that abstracts tend to be more widely read than full papers the abstract does not do justice to the paper. It would enhanced if it included short statements "We used the AVEM to assess" "Both cross-sectional and longitudinal data were generated and analysed."

Strengths and Limitations: It should be acknowledged that the study is based on a self-report instrument.

Conclusions: The study set out to compare medical and STEM students. Given that there has been much research into and comment about the impact of medical education on the mental health of the former, within the context of the duration of this study medical students did not appear to be more negatively affected than their STEM counterparts.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**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**
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