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MS: 8852412086478273 - What Motivates Senior Clinicians To Teach Medical Students?
Response to reviewers' comments
Reviewer 1
Minor Essential Revisions

Some of the defects mentioned in the review are only a matter of wording and can easily be rectified e.g.,

. the difference between convenience sampling vs. querying the entire population - sample more clearly
described,
. clarifying what is meant by repeat measures - comment deleted as most likely to lead to confusion rather
than clarity
. The authors need to consider seriously whether they wish to remain silent concerning the kind of factor
analysis and rotation (if any) that they used. - both now described in text
. The authors also need to give serious attention to the issue of motivation and to whether it is automatically
captured via Q methodology. Q methodology does capture perspectives, but the concept of motivation
seems to imply something a bit more tricky. - this useful comment added to the Discussion

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

. Much of what has been said or implied in the review below may be considered discretionary. The best
practices recommendations about Q-sample and P-set design are for the authors consideration in their next
Q study - noted.
. If Q methodology is not well known to readers of the journal, then adding some
of the references noted might be useful to readers and also serve to help legitimate the current study. -
considered already sufficiently references though useful for later work with thanks
. I would also leave it to the authors as to whether they wish to adhere to the notion that Q yields ipsative
data - this matter was reflected upon, further reviewed and a decision taken to continue with this description

Reviewer 2
Major Compulsory Revisions

. The abstract results section clearly shows the results of the demographics of the study's participants.
However, given the importance of the abstract to those who may wish to access this paper, the authors
should make the results of the study more evident. - results more fully described in abstract
. Reference 3 in the text is Hertzberg but in the reference list it is Covington. Hertzberg doesn't not appear
on the reference list and this should be corrected. - Ref 3 referred to previous sentence (now edited to make
clearer). Hertzberg quoted in Ellis now made clear.
. Add the date the referenced website was accessed. - done

Minor Essential Revisions

Ethical research is important. The authors should state whether or not they applied for and were granted
research ethics approval from any body. For example in the UK this kind of research requires NHS research
ethics approval. - now mentioned under method
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

These comments really relate to clarification of details included in the papers, which the authors should consider seriously to make the paper more easily understandable, especially to those less familiar with the research methodology.

. The group of clinicians that contributed to the construction of the statements - How many were there? What were the demographics (you emphasise the demographics of the study participant but that information is not available for the original group.)? Was the group representative of the eventual sample or were there unique characteristics of this group? - Yes this has now been made clear in the Methods.

. Bias - The authors should consider a further discussion about their personal approach to the study participants. Different members of the research team gave the instructions to different participants. Was there any possible bias in this process? The authors say that the data was anonymous but that seems unlikely given the fact that the researcher returned to the participant after 10 minutes to collect the cards and record the data. - this useful comment has been made clear under limitations.

. Factor analysis: This section is not as transparent as others aspects of the research. I suggest that the authors give each factor a title or label as well as the number for greater clarity; it is easy to get lost here. (As one would do in creating/naming themes in grounded theory) - done.