

## Reviewer's report

**Title:** "That Never Would Have Occurred To Me": A Qualitative Study of Medical Students' Views of a Cultural Competence Curriculum

**Version:** 1 **Date:** 3 March 2006

**Reviewer:** Jesse Crosson

### Reviewer's report:

General

The article addresses an important area of medical education about which there is limited published research. The methods used for data collection and analysis are appropriate to the subject matter. I would like to see more of the qualitative data used in the paper. Since the focus groups and interviews were transcribed verbatim, the use of actual participant quotes would strengthen the paper.

-----  
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The background section is a reasonably good survey of the cultural competence literature. I am not sure how the authors see the current paper as fitting into this literature. What is the gap that you are addressing with this study? The issues brought up in the last paragraph of this section are not carried through the paper effectively.

In the methods section: the numbers in the first two paragraphs do not add up. The number of participants is variously stated as 16 and 17. The "purposive" sampling of students needs to be more clearly described.

I am unfamiliar with the term "question route" - I suggest using the term "interview guide" or "schedule of focus group questions".

The term "theoretical triangulation" should be defined and referenced.

In the results section: the results are presented in summary form without much in the way of supporting quotes from the subjects. As such, it is not possible to verify the accuracy of the authors analysis. It is unclear where the bolded headings in this section come from. Are they the topic areas from the guide or did these groupings arise from the data analysis?

The second paragraph on the strengths of the CCC dealing with the informal curriculum would be greatly strengthened by the use of substantive examples of "informal teaching".

On page 11, there is a footnote marker #20. Is this supposed to be here? It is in a different format from the footnotes in the background.

The discussion section is a restatement of the results.

The limitation that "only students with opinions" participated should be eliminated. A better discussion of the purposive sampling strategy in the methods section could give the authors a better

sense of the limitations of the study.

-----  
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-----  
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.