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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)

The description of the search methodology is vague. (e.g. number of full papers or abstracts, English language, human limits, etc.). The reference list seems to be missing some of the citations from the literature (see references below).
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It is unclear to me whether the objective of the study was to document and recommend best practices gleaned from the literature to show satisfaction with improvements to the journal club format over time or both.

The provision of food and departmental faculty participation are very important characteristics for success and not including them in the authors’ journal club is a weakness that should be justified.

The use of previously validated rather than local de novo structured checklists for review has been advocated by journals for reviewers and for journal club and has been associated with improvement over time in practice based learning in the literature (see references).

The discussion should leverage the UNIQUE contributions of a journal club in Pakistan to the literature that might include 1) limited resources, 2) limited access to print publications, 3) limited funding etc. that might improve or streamline the process elsewhere.

The introduction should explicitly state the purpose of the study.

Methods: The primary outcome measure should be defined in the methods and the abstract. The methods should include how the articles were selected.

The results might be better presented as a pre and post survey. It is difficult to tell from the way that the data is presented if the journal club is an improvement or not over nothing (no control group) or whether or not an intervention for improving the journal club was performed?

The survey instrument was not provided?
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: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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