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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions -- none

Minor Essential Revisions -- In the Summary paragraph of the abstract, the second full sentence does not make sense ( . . what is expected of them when with all actors . . . )

In the first paragraph of the discussion, please explain briefly what the different perspectives are that Boenink describes.

The following sentence switches the voice of the manuscript. It should be edited.
"To conclude our brief overview of commonly cited authors, Jack Mezirow must also be included."

The reference to Trail in the text has a parenthesis in the wrong place. I believe it should go after "action" not after "Trail."

"emphasised" is spelled incorrectly

"writings skills" is spelled incorrectly

Discretionary Revisions -- The literature on content specificity of clinical reasoning skills has some parallels in terms of whether the skill in question can be assessed independent of the content (in that case, knowledge about a particular disease). It might be useful to at least refer to that literature in this discussion.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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