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Reviewer's report:

The present paper describes a study aimed at identifying the aspects that experts use to identify clinical reasoning in students' taking medical history. This is a very well described and conducted study - well done. It addresses a very important area and provides relevant information - based upon systematic sound research.

If research is able to identify observable indicators of diagnostic reasoning this can have very important implication to design future assessment of clinical reasoning and competence at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels. - well done!

Need to be proof-reading there are several small typos (eg. lines 29, 32, 88, etc)
line 29 "distracted" is a odd choice of word, considered using other e.g. abstracted
line 32 should read pathophysiologic thinking
line 88 reference should not have initials
All references should be before the end the sentence

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:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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