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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting article which contributes well to the literature on borderline professional judgements in health professions assessment. I have no concerns regarding the study design, data collection, the quality of the results or the discussion of the results. The only minor issues I have is with some of the specific decisions along the way. I outline these just so the authors can consider them in any revisions to the manuscript.

1. Why was a F grade converted to a numeric score of 3 out of 10 instead of a 2, 1 or 0? The allocations of the numeric values to the scoring categories seem arbitrary. This also assumes that the interval between each scoring category (F and P-) for instance is the same, which will not always be the case.

2. Similarly, when the grades were resolved up or down (see page 6), why was a 5 resolved to a 7 or a 3? There is an argument that it could be possible to resolve them to only a 6 or a 4. Would this change the outcome of the study?

3. Page 11 - '...that would have suggested that the OBM2 lacks validity'. Can you please explain this more? It is not entirely clear.

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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