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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Anne Menard:

Attached you will find the revised version of the manuscript entitled “Anxiety levels among Health Sciences students during their first visit to the dissection room” (MEED-D-19-00501R1) by Carmen Romo Barrientos; Juan Jose Criado-Alvarez; Jaime González González; Isabel Ubeda Bañon; Alicia Flores Cuadrado; Daniel Saiz-Sanchez; Antonio Viñuela; Jose Luis Martín Conty; Teresa Simón; Alino Martínez Marcos; Alicia Mohedano-Moriano to be considered for publication in BMC medical education.

We have incorporated all the suggestions and concerns raised by the reviewer. Below you will find changes incorporated. We are open to further change the manuscript whether it is requested.
Dr. Juan José Criado-Álvarez, Integrated Care Management at Talavera de la Reina, Castilla-La Mancha Health Services, Talavera de la Reina, Toledo, Spain. Department of Medical Sciences, School of Health Sciences. University of Castilla-La Mancha. Avenida Real Fábrica de las Sedas, s/n 45600 Talavera de la Reina, Toledo, Spain.

Email: jjcriado@sescam.jccm.es

Technical Comments:

1. In your Methods section you state that "their anonymity was guaranteed after filling the consent forms", however, in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section, you state that "informed consent was waived by VPH." These two statements are directly contradictory, please clarify and amend your manuscript accordingly.

"And informed consent was waived by VPH" has been removed from the Ethics approval and consent to participate. It's a mistake.

2. Please remove "All the authors have approved this publication." from the Consent for publication section.

It has been deleted

3. Please provide figure titles/legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References. If Figure titles/legends are within the main text of the manuscript, please move them.

The figure legend has already been added below the references.

Figure files should contain only the image/graphic, as well as any associated keys/annotations. If titles/legends are present within the figure files, please remove them.

It has been deleted
Reviewer reports:

Bernard John Moxham, BSc BDS PhD (Reviewer 1): The authors have dealt satisfactorily with all my comments and criticisms

Thank you for your article comments.

Robyn P. Cant, PhD, MHLthSc. (Reviewer 2): Thank you for this revision 1 of the paper. I have started to review your copy showing the track changes.

Thank you for your opinions and article comments.

Background section: citation 17 and citation 18 report components of this very study - the results for Medicine students and Occupational Therapy students. Is it ethical to cite a publication of a part of your current study as background evidence when it is a component of this submitted paper??

As you have already published results of the study as they apply to Medicine students and Occupational Therapy students plus nursing students, I suggest this paper be rejected. This paper is a compilation of those same results together with speech therapy participant results added. (Nursing results were also published: Anxiety among nursing students during their first human prossection. Article in Nurse Education Today 85:104269 · November 2019.

Your publication scheme is, I think, quite unsatisfactory when you report the results part by part in different papers and each participant group separately and then plan an overall publication. Yes, the most important paper, the overall project results, are best published in a journal with wide readership such as Medical Education.

Your publication scheme is, I think, quite unsatisfactory when you report the results part by part in different papers and each participant group separately and then plan an overall publication. Yes, the most important paper, the overall project results, are best published in a journal with wide readership such as Medical Education.
This study corresponds to a doctoral thesis of the Romo-Barrientos study that began in 2015. It was decided at that time to publish each of the Degrees separately so as not to lose immediately and because the thesis in our University by compendium of articles, are needed at least 3 JCR articles, instead of waiting for a joint study that would be more complex and would not serve as a compendium thesis.

On the other hand, each paper published focuses specifically on each Degree, and does not focus exclusively on anxiety (SA and TA-STAi), but also speaks about their feelings when visiting the dissection room: apprehensions, fear and emotions. Also, in the Medicine paper, it is focused as they improve their learning results as anxiety decreases throughout the course, and is observed in test scores. Making various measurements of anxiety throughout the course and comparing the results. The paper on Occupational Therapy studies anxiety, emotions and apprehensions but also relates the benefits of going to the dissection room with learning anatomy, looking at the results of the exam. Therefore, these papers have a different approach to paper BMC.

In this paper (BMC), a joint analysis of the different degrees of Science Health is performed, to see if there are statistically significant differences between them in the level of anxiety versus the dissection room; and it's about giving explain qualitatively why medical and nursing students have more anxiety. This point is also new, there are no works that compare the anxiety of various degrees of health sciences.

As papers 17 and 18 had already been published, reference was made to them. Occupational therapy has also been cited in the discussion. At no time is it hidden. The authors of the work have always tried to give transparency to what we have already published. We consider that this paper has a totally different objective from those published.

In addition, the nursing study was conducted in two different groups of students (because we have more than 100 students per course and the capacity of the dissection room is 55 students, so we have two groups). In this BMC Health Education article, the results of one of the Nursing groups are published, which is different from that published in Nurse Education Today. Attach the data in articles 17 and 18, so that you see that the data of the SA and TA are different from those published.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nursing education today (Nurse)</th>
<th>BMC Medical education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA before 21.3</td>
<td>SA before 31.8±33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA after 17.8</td>
<td>SA after 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomical Science education (Medicine)</td>
<td>BMC Medical education SA after 18.4±12.82,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA before 22.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TA before 22.2±17.29

SA after 12

We believe that this paper has a totally different approach to those published, we do not analyze the same thing. In addition, the above results are not published anywhere. That we have acted transparently. We respect your opinion, but I think we duly justify all your comments.

check uploaded material as a supplement.