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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for presenting this scholarly work. I provide detailed comments and suggestions for improvement below.

Background:

The currency of some of your citations is lacking as it is thought that studies of students published in 1990 or 1994 are hardly relevant in 2019- these students were a different generation, most probably not having similar viewpoints … I suggest you limit the citations to year 2000 and later? Please remove citations 33 and 15 and 16. A greater number of citations across the field is not more impressive than a smaller number of more recent studies?

Methods line 19-32: I suggest this single sentence at five lines is too long with too many ideas therein. Line 32 -36 is unclear and probably not needed. Was student consent required?

Line 54 Is the STAI used in Spanish or English? Please state it is a self-reported instrument?

Next page line 6; please describe the intervention that students experienced in the session eg you could state their learning objectives

Line 12 - what type of extra questions? (a satisfaction survey seems to be missing)

How was the data entered and was it rechecked after entry??

Results line 27: what is the response rate?

Results line 29 it is not clear what the sample was that you included in analysis?- were 7.8% excluded?

Line 39: not quite correct here? the anxiety decreased after a single session- not after the course?
Line 49 suggest commence new para

Results second page line 30: inadequate description: score out of how many? Please ensure you have described this in methods did I miss it?

Discussion line 36 please describe the 'Rite' further - unclear- is it cited anywhere.

Line 44-56 The Discussion should not re-present results (please remove or summarize) but needs to interpret the results found and relate this to what other research has found (with description) and suggest future planning?

It is not adequate to quote a series of citations [2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 22, 30, 40] or [3, 4, 8, 10, 36] alone this is not showing the reader how your results concur or disagree with recent literature. You should describe the findings of some studies that clearly relate to the type of students you have in Spanish culture (not for example Chinese students as they may be quite different) and say what these other studies found?? Make it interesting for the reader instead of boring. Please attend to this throughout. In the next section you do mention comparisons but where are these studies from?? Are they similar? are they Spanish; are they recent?

Limitations line 36: a cadaver, not a corpse? Please address the potential biases in use of a self-reported survey and remove other parts of limitations. Are the results transferable to other populations? Could more objective measures of anxiety be used?

Conclusion: The conclusion should be explanatory without citations? Where did you report satisfaction in results section? Much of the conclusion should be placed in the discussion section I think, as it seems to present implications for practice. It would even benefit the discussion section to have a heading on this.

The manuscript requires a major revision to provide a fuller description your research and its relationship to the field.
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