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Reviewer's report:
The study appears to be well designed and there is merit in the logical way it is presented. However, the main concern is the small sample size.

Although under "limitations" you do admit that the number of participants was limited, and argue that "all themes emerged from half to all of the participants and no new themes emerged therefore data saturation was considered" could be true to the 12 case history taking recordings studied, but the number of themes that can emerge could be larger, provided a larger diversity and the number of case histories studied is increased to allow Grounded theory work from a larger universe of cases to make them a more comprehensive list of indicators of clinical reasoning to look for that can be recommended (and so publishable). Hence, it is felt that the justification of the conclusions within the limitations as stated currently given the small size of sample, is misleading for the audience reading the manuscript.

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.
Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess
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:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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