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Reviewer's report:
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. There are occasional typos (principle where it should be principal and extend where it should be extent).

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.

**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.
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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