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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

thank you for revising your manuscript to address the review recommendations. You have addressed a number of the concerns identified. Please consider the following points to assist the clarity and flow of your paper. Your pedagogical strategy/action research approach provides an interesting practical framework for others to apply but needs to be communicated clearly.

The comments below are essential minor revisions.

Sentences tend to be very long and this impacts on the clarity of your paper. I would encourage you to review the flow of the paper as a whole to see where long sentences can be tightened. This would improve the precision of your key messages and ensure key points are aligned with the stated aims of the paper.

For example:

Background

• Paragraph 4, sentence 2. Start new sentences after the phrase “may still be too abstract and detailed”.
• Para 5 - First sentence is very important in setting the scene for your study. Please consider reshaping to make more direct. This aim statement also need to come earlier (perhaps in the para above)
• Para 6 – Sentence 2 – take out ‘in their mind’
• Para 6 sentence one beginning “The goal, when applied to teaching clinical reasoning is to assist clinical educators to…” I was unsure if this was the aim of your study? If so, please make this aim/sentence clear and consider moving so that it follows sentence one in the para 5 above.

Please edit the other sections of your paper in a similar fashion.

Methods

Please combine the separate section headed Methodology: ‘Action research for professional learning’ into your methods section (as per author guidelines). Methods - includes the design of your study (action research), the research setting, the participants involved, a clear description of all interventions and comparisons, and the type of analysis used.
Results
Please consider providing de-identified labels for quotes used to highlight the diversity/depth of participant responses e.g. ‘physiotherapist educator’ (or similar descriptor)

The additional concrete examples of participant responses that you have added to the revised manuscript (as requested) are helpful - but be careful not to overwhelm your readers with data. It is a fine balance to manage. For example - please consider removing the theme 1 quote “They liked the idea and key words …” as the three previous responses highlight this point.

Theme 2 sub heading 1 Consider shortening to "Discerning teaching styles for clinical reasoning"
Theme 2 sub heading 2- Is a little unclear - consider changing to reflect theme/quotes which appeared to be about 'refining strategies for teaching clinical reasoning'

Conclusion
Please consider including the point made in your abstract re: scaffolding in articulating aspects of clinical reasoning - A strong linking point to make.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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