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Response to the reviewer’s comments

Dear Rintaro Imafuku,

Thank you very much for your feedback concerning the above manuscript. Please be informed that minor amendments have been made according to reviewers’ comments which are highlighted yellow in pages 10,13,14 and in Table 6, page 27. Nature Research Editing Service did the proof reading of the manuscript.

We hope that we have responded to the comments adequately and the revised version now meets the requirements for publication in BMC Medical Education.

For your kind information, we will not be available from July 15 until August 25, 2019 because of summer vacation.

In case of acceptance, the publication fees of this manuscript can be paid before July 15, 2019 and the galley proof after August 25, 2019.
Kind regards.

Yours Sincerely,

Professor Khalid A. Jassim Al Khaja
Chair, Department of Pharmacology and Therapeutics
College of Medicine and Medical Sciences
Arabian Gulf University, PO Box 22979
Email: khlidj@agu.edu.bh

Response to the reviewer’s comments

Reviewer 1 comment:

The Discussion section remains a bit lengthy and repetitive. The first 2 paragraphs repeat several points already made in the Introduction. Many of the results are also repeated. The authors should summarize …..etc.

Authors` response:

We disagree because further shortening of the discussion may likely to affect the logical sequence.

Reviewer 1 comment:

Explain how this study expands what is already known and highlight areas for future research.

Authors` response:

Please see under conclusion, lines 291-295, page 14

Reviewer 1 comment:

The manuscript needs editing for grammar and punctuation.

Authors` response:

It has been done by Nature Research Editing Service
Reviewer 2 comment:

Their revision process has been rigorous and the authors have adequately addressed all points raised by the reviewers.

Authors` response:

Thank you very much for your compliments

Reviewer 3 comment:

(1) I would like to add one paragraph in the Discussion section to clearly state the limitations of the study. Especially, the associations found in the study may not be robust as a multivariate approach was not employed and other factors (e.g. family income) may also affect absenteeism and performance

Authors` response:

The students family income as a reason for absenteeism has been refuted, see lines 204-208, page 10. The recommended limitations by reviewer 3 has been inserted, under limitations (lines 282-284, page 13).

Reviewer 3 comment:

(2) consider providing suggestions on future research in the Discussion section. For example, a questionnaire survey of students may be needed to study reasons for absenteeism.

Authors` response:


Reviewer 3 comment:

(3) Language corrections are still needed.

Authors` response:

It has been done by Nature Research Editing Service.
Reviewer 3 comment:

(4) Please provide chi-square test values in Table 6.

Authors` response:

We agree. See table 6, page 27.

Reviewer 3 comment:

(5) No need to repeat "a p-value<0.05 is statically significant" below tables.

Authors` response:

We agree. We have deleted the statement.