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Dear Professor Partridge,

COVER LETTER
We hereby re-submit our manuscript (5970704491382783) online titled “The relationship between learning preferences (styles and approaches) and learning outcomes among pre-clinical undergraduate medical students” for your consideration for publication in the BMC Medical Education.

We have revised the manuscript to address the comments made by both the reviewers. The concerns were addressed in “point forms” in the MS word document below, following this covering letter.

We would like to emphasise again that this study would add to strengthen the value of knowing students’ preferred learning styles and approaches which could further improve our goal to enhance more student-centered education; nurturing them to be lifelong learners and therefore better potentiate their success.

The work is original and the manuscript is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. All authors were involved in all stages of work, i.e. from conception to the writing of the manuscript. The content of this manuscript has not been published elsewhere.

All authors state no conflict of interests.
We look forward to hearing a favourable reply from you.

We would be grateful if the manuscript could be re-assessed as soon as possible as the re-extension of the dateline for the grant to support this study will soon expire.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

SC LI EW

Siaw Cheok LI EW
DATE: 2nd February 2015
BMC Medical Education- Responses to reviewers’ comments

“The relationship between learning preferences (styles and approaches) and learning outcomes among pre-clinical undergraduate medical students”

Reviewer 1

1. Line 94-Sentence changed to The “meshing hypothesis” states rather than The “meshing hypothesis” stated.

2. Line 96- Sentence changed to “Pashler et. al. argue” rather than “Pashler et. al. had argued”.

3. Line 107- Sentence changed to “one of their platforms for student” rather than “one of their platform for student”.

4. The result section on Baseline Information should be written in present tense, not past tense- The result section on Baseline Information has been changed to present tense.

5. Line 250- “proportions” is used rather than “proportion” (Line 248)

6. Line 281- Sentence changed to “Indiana, USA was of the Read/Write (R) modality” rather than “Indiana USA was of Read/Write (R) modality”. (Line 277)

7. Line 296-Typo corrected as “Bahadori et. al. was 59%” rather than “Bahadori et. al. was59%”. (Line 292)

8. Line 347-Sentence changed to “of the students in this study did” rather than “of the students did”. (Line 343).

9. Please change the labels in Table 1 from “(%)” to “n (%)”- Labels changed as per suggestion.

Reviewer 2

1. The rationale for using a score of 65% as the cut off point for mid/high achievers is included in the footnote.

2. A footnote explaining the rationale for combining these two approaches (deep/strategic) to the reader is included.