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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for this revision 1 of the paper. I have started to review your copy showing the track changes.

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 prosection. 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.

Furthermore, the project results are reported in a thesis which will also be available for readers. Please try to better understand ethical issues in publishing.

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.

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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
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1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
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If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
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I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.
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