

	Editor's comment	Author's comment <i>(If agreed with the editor, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Yes. CBE is an topic that many within DPT Education are interested. Thank you for presenting a tangible way of including this within residential DPT education.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Yes. The title is appropriate. Though the majority of the work is regarding open text versus closed text assessments and format of the assessments. The connection to CBE is rather loose. The connection to CBE should be more clearly outlined if this portion of the manuscript.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes.	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes.	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	The methods and results are clear and well presented. The introduction and discussion could use greater detail in connecting this paper to CBE. What competency does this learning address? How does this connect with core competencies? Which core competency? What proposed framework? The paper details valued educational adult learning principles of including learner choice, open book vs closed book assessments, as well as more open assessment periods,	

	however these educational formats need to be more clearly aligned with current work on DPT CBE competencies and frameworks. Details regarding how the competency was set for the learning as well as what competency was reached, how the learning was remediated to ensure competency, otherwise this manuscript should be rewritten to focus on a variety of learner assessments and formats both of which can be implemented outside a CBE framework.	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.		

PART 1: Article Title:

PART 2:

	Editor's comment	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i>	
	No	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	No	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	No	
Do you think a Disclaimer is required to explain the history of this manuscript? (As in most cases chapters of reference books	No	

are extended versions of previously published articles in some journals)		
--	--	--

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Editor:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write “I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer.

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
<p>Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0)</p> <p>Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)</p>	<p>Overall the manuscript presents an interesting and practical application of a varied assessment of anatomy in residential DPT education. The manuscript includes appropriate details regarding methods, analysis, and results. The connection to CBE is over-emphasized within the manuscript as the authors are often referring to learner choice or varied formats for assessment.</p> <p>The manuscript should be better situated within the current context and discussion of CBE if the authors continue to decide to try to continue this connection, otherwise this work should be reframed within educational best practices of learner choice including assessment windows and a variety of formats for assessment.</p> <p>Key Areas to Address</p> <p>1. Identify the Competency</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Specify which competency the learning activity is designed to address.○ For example: <i>Does this activity target clinical reasoning, professional judgment, or self-directed learning?</i> <p>2. Connect to Core Competencies and Frameworks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Reference an established framework (e.g., APTA CBE Framework, Entrustable Professional Activities (EPAs), or CAPTE-required competencies).○ State explicitly: <i>Which core competency is being developed?</i>○ Example: <i>This assessment supports the “Critical Thinking and Clinical Decision-Making” competency outlined in [framework name].</i> <p>3. Clarify Competency Achievement and Remediation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Explain how competency attainment was measured.○ If learners did not meet the standard, describe remediation strategies.○ Example: <i>Learners who scored below the threshold were provided targeted feedback and required to complete additional case-based exercises.</i> <p>4. Align Adult Learning Principles with CBE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The paper mentions learner choice, open-book vs. closed-book assessments, and flexible timing—these are excellent adult learning strategies.○ Show how these strategies support competency
--	---

	<p>development rather than just offering variety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Example: <i>Learner choice in assessment format promotes autonomy, which aligns with the competency of professional self-direction.</i> <p>5. If CBE Alignment Is Not Possible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Consider reframing the paper as a discussion of assessment innovations and learner-centered approaches outside of a strict CBE context.
--	---