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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your successful efforts in performing this piece of scholarly work - "How can educators improve the perception of happiness for pre-clinical medical students?". This is an interesting correspondence paper that addresses an important topic and contributing to the pedagogical discourse within medical education.

This reviewer has just a few questions or requests for clarifications that might increase the quality of the paper and support the assessment of credibility among future readers.

Paging could have been provided to facilitate provision of comments.

Please include the following or reflect upon in the manuscript (MS):

Title
*This reviewer appreciates the authors using a rhetorical question in the title. However, it could help the presumptive reader using a subtitle indicating that the correspondence paper takes a critical perspective.

Abstract
*Please make sure the purpose is congruent with the aim the main report (see comment further down).
*Please be aware that many of your key indexing terms that will assist indexers in cross-indexing your presumptive paper are NOT from the Index Medicus Medical Subject Headings (MeSH).

Background
*First page, line 58. Please refer to the paper by Yoo and Kim using the authors family names.
*In the last paragraph of this section the authors use the term "...critical perspective..." This reviewer feels that this better reflects the paper than the wording used in the abstract... "..critically analyse...".

Main text
*It is possible that "Main text" is a prefixed heading used in the journal. If not, this reviewer recommends the authors to use a more descriptive heading or use the heading "Main body".
*Please define what you mean with educational environment. Do the authors equal "educational environment" with "learning environment"?
*It would assist the reader in an educational correspondence paper if the author/s could make demarcations of some concepts used in the MS, such as learning, teaching and education as they...
bare different ontological and epistemological connotations depending on the presumptive reader’s perspective. It is, for this reviewer very important to state how you look upon learning. What is they position of the authors? Do you hold a constructivist, cognitivist, behaviorist and/or pragmatist view?

*Second page, line 52. Try to dampen the local context or explain it more fully. As it stands now it might me difficult for some of the BMC Medical Education international readers to fully understand the text as they (this reviewer included) is not be explicitly familiar with this specific context.

*Third page, line 7. This reviewer recommends the authors to delete the word "all" and clarify that this is the assumption held by the authors.

*This reviewer really like that the authors use first person for personal pronouns and possessive forms bit this writing style should be used throughout the paper.

*Third page, line 37. Please illuminate what the authors mean with educators. Which level are the authors referring to? Micro level such as teachers, tutors, supervisors; or meso level such as program directors or head of departments; or macro level such as vice-chancellor and educational leaders. Please elaborate!

*Page three, line 58. Please clarify for the presumptive readers what SGUL "mums and dads". Caveat for contextuality!

Conclusion

*Page four, line 26. This review is not clear what the authors mean by "…. requires no validation". This reviewer tried to search for this (with limited time) in the paper by Yoo and Kim but without success. The authors are encouraged to expand.

*This reviewer recommends avoiding using a reference in the conclusion.

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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