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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Please see below; design and execution need to be clarified with regard to blinding.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
* Did the authors address the reviewers' previous comments?
Partially; it is still unclear to me whether those in the traditional learning group were blinded to the fact that virtual reality was available. It might lead to less engagement and satisfaction with traditional learning if they were aware something "better" was available. Although lack of blinding would not preclude publication in my opinion, the possibility of the dynamics described above should at least be acknowledged as a potential study limitation.
The end of the discussion and conclusion (beginning with line 19 on page 7 through the conclusion) seem overly verbose and a bit redundant. The authors added text, presumably to satisfy the other reviewer. But in my opinion, this only adds to what already seems a bit rambling. A focused discussion should emphasize their observations (improved anatomical understanding and learning satisfaction) in the context of the existing literature in this area.

**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.

No

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

No

**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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable
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