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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the article title” A nationwide cross-sectional survey of student experiential practice at community pharmacies in South Korea.

The overall goal of this survey research was to evaluate Korean students' perceptions the their experiential education. There is great amount of information presented and opportunities for improvement. The introduction was clear and provided a good background to the readers. The first descriptive part of survey results was generally clear and easy to follow. The inferential part was not sufficiently described in the methods and subsequently difficult to follow in the results section. Also, the manuscript would benefit from a English review. Specific comments as shown below:

Abstract:

-Methods: consider modifying the methods and results based on my comments below.

-The conclusion on the abstract should be more precise and centered on specific findings. I do think that more information is presented in the conclusion of the manuscript that could be used for the abstract.

Manuscript


Line 98: Please consider using the term 6th year instead of 6th grade

Line 98: What is the population size that was targeted? Can you provide an estimate of how many 6th year students received the survey? This gives an idea of the sample frame.

Line 112: Consider indicating what type validity was evaluated. Content? Construct? Face validity?

Line 117 Spell out CAPE for the first time.
I'm not sure a descriptive analysis can identify associations please re-phrase to reflect that this is a descriptive analyses that summarizes items responses.

This part present limited details and should be expanded. First, please be more specific about what the dependent variables are. It was mentioned that the survey had 17 items related to change in competency of outcomes? Did you run a model for each? Did you select one or two items? How did you assess co-linearity? Since each domains has multiple items what was the approach taken?

Please present the items perhaps as an appendix. Second, what was the p value use for model building? What type of approach was used for variable selection? Backwards elimination? Stepwise? How did you assess goodness of fit?. Which demographic variables were used in the adjusted model if any? All this information should be provided.

Line 136, can you provide an approximate repose rate? What percentage of all 6th year students those 646 represent?

Remove s from "others", what do you mean by handled? Dispensed? sold?

Table 1 Revise style, consider not starting a sentence with a number.

A large percentage of respondents did not plan to undergo elective APPE in a community pharmacy. This is an interesting finding that merit discussion in the discussion section.

Consider rephrasing this sentence.

Delete "whether"

Table 3. Please add a footnote that explain where the positive and negative percentages are coming from. Use capital letter consistently.

Line 154 again, what was the dependent variable? How was it measure? How model was selected? Independent variables selection? Model fit statistics?

Table 4

I'm confused about the 95%CI and the p values. I would expect to be related. But for some items the CI crosses zero yet the p value is significant. Additionally, some of the beta coefficients estimates shown are outside the 95%CI. Why? This section needs major revisions.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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

Yes

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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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