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Author’s response to reviews:
Dear Mrs. Symmons and Mrs. Partrigde,

Thank you for considering publication of our manuscript. Below you will find a point by point response to the comments.

Kind regards,
Catharina Haring

Editor Comments:
1. Please note that all manuscripts must contain all the following sections under the heading 'Declarations'. The Declarations should follow the Conclusions section, and be before the References.

Abbreviations
Ethics approval and consent to participate Consent for publication Availability of data and material Competing interests
Funding
Authors' contributions
Acknowledgements

Please see here for details on the information to be included in these sections: http://bmcmededuc.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript/research-article

If the information required is already provided in the main manuscript, please also copy the relevant statements to the Declarations.

If any of the sections are not relevant to your manuscript, please include the heading and write 'Not applicable' for that section.

Response: All sections are present under the heading ‘Declarations’.

2. In the Ethics approval and consent to participate section please state the full name of the IRB whose guidelines you followed.

Response: the full name was stated

3. Please remove the legend embedded within the figure 1 file. All figure titles/legends should be placed at the end of the main manuscript, after the References, and not within any of the figure files.

Response: titles/legends were removed and placed at the end of the main manuscript.

Reviewer reports:
Stephen Loftus (Reviewer 1): Thank you for asking me to review the manuscript, "Assessment of clinical reasoning in medical practice. Observable phenomena that reveal clinical reasoning during history taking of medical students: a qualitative study". The paper describes a grounded theory approach that made use of senior clinicians' observations of what they saw as relevant to
clinical reasoning when observing recordings of medical students conducting patient assessments. They conclude with a model that attempts to bring the findings together. The model is intriguing and could be useful in developing insights into clinical reasoning. I think the paper is publishable and the readership will find it of interest.

The authors appear to have addressed the concerns raised in previous reviews. However, the Methods section needs a little clarification. There is plenty of detail about the recordings made of the students assessing patients. I presume the experts reviewing these recordings were themselves recorded and the analysis performed on the recordings of the experts making their comments? This is implied but not explicitly stated.

Response: This presumption is correct. Thank you very much for this useful comment. We added the sentence: ‘During this sessions audio recordings of the think-aloud process were made for data analysis.’

There are occasional typos (principle where it should be principal and extend where it should be extent).

Response: typos were corrected

For future work, the authors might extend their approach to a study of expertise itself. Recording experts commenting on the errors of beginners could be a marvellous opportunity to study clinical reasoning in experts. For future work too, I would recommend the authors consider other ways to view clinical reasoning rather than restrict themselves to a cognitivist view of clinical reasoning. For me, interpretation was a theme that came out of the reported findings although this seems to be underplayed in the paper. For the future, I would recommend the authors consider other theoretical frameworks, such as hermeneutics. The work of Kathryn Montgomery (such as "How Doctors Think") might be a good place to start.

Response: thank you for your suggestions
Thomas Chacko (Reviewer 2): Explanation & additions made in response to my comments
Accepted

Salman Y. Guraya, FRCS, Masters MedEd (Reviewer 3):
The authors have done the required changes and the paper is acceptable