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Response to Sharon Buckley

Major compulsory revision:

1. Additional text has been added in the abstract.
2. Additional text has been added in the background section of the manuscript.
3. Additional text has been added in the method section of the manuscript.
4. A summary of the findings is included, as requested, see Figure 3.

Minor essential revision:

1. Clarification has been made in the text (concerning the region).
2. A reference from a medical context is included

Discretionary revision:

1. Text concerning further research has been added to the conclusion.

Response to Mr. Johann Steurer

1. Text has been added concerning the objectives of this study (see background).
2. In beginning of the background section we have given our view of theoretical knowledge in relation to clinical experience, stating that theoretical knowledge is one of the types of knowledge included in clinical experience. In this study, clinical experience is expressed as clinical approaches in clinical situations. By this, we do not mean that theoretical knowledge and experience are two entities; they are both included in clinical approaches. In their statements, the junior doctors use more theoretical argumentation in clinical judgements compared with senior doctors. This does not mean that junior doctors incorporate more theoretical knowledge than senior doctors (in fact, they probably use less), but theoretical knowledge is more prominently expressed by the junior doctors.

3. The language has been corrected and the passages that you had difficulty in understanding have been reformulated. We hope this will make the text easier to follow.

4. What is new is included in the conclusion.

Response to Manjeet Shemar

1. Question – additions have been made in the manuscript concerning the definition of professionalism and the question.

2. Methods - The educational experience of senior doctors has been removed from the text, as it is not of interest in this investigation.

3. Discussion and Conclusion- Additions have been made concerning the effects of the interviews (methodological considerations). Adjustments have been made to the conclusion in order to better correspond with the result.

4. The text has been copy-edited by a professional copy-editor.

5. Since (as you correctly pointed out) “younger doctors”, could be offensive to some readers, this has been replaced with “junior doctors”.

On behalf of the authors
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