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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Ms. Pafitis,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript entitled “Modification of an OSCE format to enhance patient continuity”. We appreciate the thoughtful comments of the reviewers. Reviewer 1’s comments pertain to future research and have not been addressed in this manuscript. We have responded to Reviewer 2’s comments as outlined below, as well as highlighting these changes in the manuscript. We hope we have satisfactorily addressed the reviewer’s concerns.

1. Method, 2nd paragraph: modified as suggested.

2. Study sites: On page 8, in the Methods, we have added a sentence clarifying why an analysis by study site was not undertaken.

3. Outcome measures: We have clarified on page 8 of the Methods that a mean score greater than 3 was required to pass.

4. Statistical analysis: We have clarified the reason for the ANOVA on page 8 of the Methods.

5. Descriptive statistics: We have interpreted the findings for the reader with an additional statement on page 8.

6. Variance components: Suggested changes have been incorporated on pages 9 & 10.

7. Inter-rater reliabilities: We do not feel that displaying the individual inter-rater reliabilities would strengthen the manuscript, as they were all consistent and in a similar range.

8. Discussion, 2nd para: We have used the term ‘consequences’ as this is the term used by Downing (reference 13) to describe this type of validity evidence.
9. Discussion, 5th para: We have made the suggested changes on page 13. Once again, thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript.