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Reviewer's report:

General

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

1. The definition of expert is fairly different from that used in other studies. In this study, expert referred to "seasoned" content experts while non-experts were "novice" content experts. In other studies, non-experts were not necessarily familiar with the content. This might actually be a strength of the study in that it adds another dimension to the study of the characteristics of facilitators that make for successful PBL. This might be highlighted, or at least made clearer.

2. It is unclear why the Likert scale was dichotomized. Please explain. It would also be valuable to run the chi-square with the 4 options to see if different findings are obtained. Discussion of any discrepancies could be enlightening.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

1. Material on page 8 is currently under results, but it would be more properly placed in the methods section.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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 of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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