Reviewer’s report

Title: Pimping: A tradition of gendered disempowerment

Version: 0 Date: 03 Mar 2019

Reviewer: Ahmed Waqas

Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

This is an incredibly written manuscript that draws attention to a very common practice of "pimping" in bed-side teaching. It reads very well, however, I would like to suggest some changes.

a) While describing the origins of the term "pimping", the authors mention the history rightly. They mention its first appearance in medical literature in 1989- however, the first mention is credited to William Harvey in 1628, and was also noted by Flexner as part of his visit to Johns Hopkins in 1916 while he was working on the famous Flexner report. The following reference may prove valuable in revising the present manuscript:

b) Medical pimping is often equated with Socratic method of teaching- authors should further elaborate the differences between these two methods. Socrates inspired the young Athenians to think critically and gain wisdom, and medical pimping, in contrast, promotes a hierarchy, and damages students' self esteem. Please ,see table 1 of:
c) A high proportion of teaching faculty uses pimping in their teaching and consider it effective. The authors should provide some reasoning for this. Following paper reports some predictors of pimping.


e) I would also recommend the authors to draw readers' attention to reformed pedagogical techniques that can replace pimping. How should the students be taught?

f) The following editorial in JAMA, mentioned plans to counter negative student experiences in Johns Hopkins. McCarthy CP, McEvoy JW. Pimping in medical education: lacking evidence and under threat. JAMA. 2015 Dec 8;314(22):2347-8. These should be added in the manuscript.

Best wishes,
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