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Reviewer’s report:

Discussion line 51: "Cadaver CT scans are inferior because the do not demonstrate living anatomy". This is not true with respect to acquire factual anatomical knowledge. Please rephrase.

"For example, bowel obstruction is diagnosed based on the pattern of gas in the small and large bowel and a CT scan of a cadaver would not be able to display". I do not agree; the aim of teaching anatomy is first to teach "normal" non-pathological anatomy, before stepping into clinical pathological anatomy.

Page 13: Line 31-36: your conclusion is not supported by your findings. Remember that a survey cannot replace exam scores when assessing the efficacy of an educational method.

Additionally, you need to include in the limitations that this is a cohort study; no comparative group was used for testing students perception. More, 78% and 73% are good rates but not very good, you should comment more on these numbers; these are your findings.

Most of the discussion is based on the feasibility; more emphasis is needed on its suitability to enhance anatomy knowledge. You need to check the meta-analysis of Yammine and Violato for the effectiveness of 3D techniques in teaching anatomy, and include it in the intro and discussion.

Was there any differences between anatomical regions?

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.

No

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.
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