Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. The steps described here to validate a marking rubric are likely to be of interest to educators of health professionals. I note, however that the journal does "not make editorial decisions on the basis of the interest of a study or its likely impact". Rather the journal is concerned with (scientific) research studies. This implies a research question, and a question was not immediately apparent. While the final decision on publication belongs with the editor this omission does seem to be an issue.

I note that some of the material in the paper (for example table 1) has been published in Jorm, C., Nisbet, G., Roberts, C., Gordon, C., Gentilcore, S., & Chen, T. F. (2016). Using complexity theory to develop a student-directed interprofessional learning activity for 1220 healthcare students. BMC medical education, 16(1), 199 and the table needs to be 'quoted' to make this clear.

I suggest the background section outlines the actual assessment the students were asked to do. I know that this has been reported elsewhere, but its absence means the reader is confused as to exactly what is being discussed.

The research work carried out is described as ensuring content validity. The way I read it is that it is more like a check of reliability - can the tool produce consistent results when used by a group of markers? Validity is only a part of this and seems to me to have been dealt with when the designers used the literature to decide the domains that required assessment. The study
appears to relate more to the extent to which markers are able to use the rubric to distinguish between levels of performance.

I also question the extent to which the participants involved (a group of health professional students and clinicians) had the videographic expertise to distinguish accurately among the performance level in this domain. I think the paper needs to comment on this.

Finally, no mention is made of how, or if, the rankings were combined in anyway to produce a single result for each group (or student). This is an important step in any assessment and speaks to validation. If a single score is produced how is this done, are all aspects treated equally in any combination?

I appreciate that this exercise is an important step in scaling up an assessment for mass usage, but the paper fails to mention that other factors are also very important. Those items such as training assessors, check marking, moderation etc. All of these are also vital in using this (or most) tool at scale.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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