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Dear Editor and manuscript Reviewers

Thank you for taking the time to review my paper. I appreciate the feedback you provided, which has helped to clarify the work. I have addressed the comments and ask you to please review them to ensure that they are aligned with your expectations.

Please feel free to refer the paper back if you feel that there is additional work that can be done.

Response to reviewers comments
The reviewers both suggested a clarification of the main aim of the paper as the major issue to be addressed. I have reworked the paper so as to reduce the emphases of the first 2 study questions, and increased the relative emphasis of the third study question, which is now the main part of this paper. I have made the following changes in response to reviewer comments, as well as inconsistencies I picked up:

- Several minor grammatical and editorial changes to improve the flow and consistency of the text, which are not noted here (no significant changes to the theme of the paper were introduced)
- Changes to the reference formatting i.e. capitalising article titles (although I notice that the BMC Medical Education formatting guidelines suggest that no unnecessary capitalisation be used)
- Major editing to reduce the total word count (from 6262, to 4175), by removing content that was redundant, or that did not serve to emphasise the main point of the paper
- Major editing in order to address the suggested change in article emphasis, which I have summarised in the sections below

Title
I changed the title slightly to better reflect the the main aim of the paper, as well as to align it with the rest of the changes that were suggested.

Abstract
Minor changes to reduce the emphasis of the first two study questions, and clearly identified the main aim of the paper.
Introduction
Minor changes to reduce the emphasis of the first two study questions. However, I have left the bulk of the information in the Introduction that places the main (i.e. third) study question in context, in line with the suggestion of the second reviewer.

Methods
I removed some content describing the panels for the study, as some of the information was redundant.

In response to the first reviewers request to provide previous evidence of the modified approach used, I can only say that I was not able to find other studies that have used this exact implementation of the Delphi. However, I have provided citations to provide evidence that there is no reason to exclude this interpretation of the Delphi. The features of a traditional Delphi method are aligned with what this study set out to achieve. However, the implementation was different. I could find no data that suggested why this implementation should not be allowed.

Results
The opening paragraph of this section has been re-written in order to highlight the main aim of the paper i.e. identifying a technology-mediated approach to developing capability in healthcare students.

I edited the section to provide a basic, summarised outline of the results of the first and second study questions, again, merely to position the third round responses in context. I was concerned about removing the supporting evidence (i.e. the quotes) for the conclusions arrived at during the first and second rounds of the study, but have done so in order to focus on presenting the data that is aligned with the main aim of the paper. In these changes I tried to limit the points to only the most relevant ones, rather than trying to present everything. I now have only two (fairly lengthy) paragraphs that present the main findings of the first 2 rounds, albeit without supporting quotes. I hope that this is in line with the suggestions of the reviewers. Should this not be the case, I am happy to rework the paper again.

Discussion
The Discussion now includes only a summarised outline of the first 2 rounds, in order to
place the third round discussion in context.

The parts of the discussion that dealt explicitly with the third round of the Delphi study have been left without much editing, other than to ensure continuity of the section.

Paragraph 7 validity: Considering that the vast majority of that particular paragraph were unrelated to the main aim of the paper, I have removed it entirely.

Conclusion
I added another sentence that emphasises the main point of the paper.