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Reviewer's report:

This study has the potential to add to the literature, despite its relatively small focus. Previous literature identified that the gap in our understanding of anatomy education, is within the domain of long-term retention of anatomy knowledge. The focus of this study is this poorly understood area, and thus warrants interest.

Background:

Line 2 (first sentence of section), this sentence does not make sense in English. This type of issues is peppered throughout the manuscript. I would recommend working with a native English speaker to refine the syntax of the manuscript, as this will improve readability and comprehension.

Page 4 Lines 1-14: Would it be possible to expand into the why behind these findings? This may help contextualize the results and discussion a bit more.

Methods:

The impact of the final results would be enhanced with a clearer outline (maybe a figure?) on 1. When the original course was administered vs. 2. When the study was conducted. This will allow the reader to understand what the "retention" time is for the knowledge taught.

Results:

Would it be possible to include the exam as supplemental material? If not, a breakdown of types of questions (first order vs. higher order) may be helpful. Essentially the results are linked to this exam, so understanding the types of content covered in the exam is important for contextualizing the results.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting work.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

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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