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Reviewer's report:

At first, thank you for the important work of clarification and rewriting. The limitations of the study were clearly identified and discussed.

Background: notify crowbach, internal consistency, inter-rater reliability, construction validity, discriminating ability of PPT. It is important to understand the clinician's confidence. At least the face validity of this PPT (step 2). It is important to know the face validity of this PPT to know if the test is easy to use and reliable for health workers, especially for nurses.

The face validity and the inter-rater reliability (nurse-doctor) of the STUMBL influence your conclusion on the social impact and the role of the diagnostic tool.

It does not seem sufficient to note that PPT has excellent predictive performance.

Methodology: the requests for clarification have been made.

Objective of this study: qualitative the impact on clinical practice of a PPT.

Discussion:

the "Limitations" paragraph has been added. Biases are now clearly notified.

Conclusion: the conclusion is clear and precise the limitations of this study.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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