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compare two different teaching methods. This paper contributes to the knowledge on evaluation of clinical judgement in a context where it has not been done before.

**TITLE AND ABSTRACT**
The title of this paper could provide a clearer signpost to the content. It does not provide enough detail regarding development and validation of the Chinese version of the Lasater Clinical Judgement Rubric (LCJR). This might be useful to include in the title.
The abstract is structured and concise.

**INTRODUCTION AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**
The introduction points out the overall importance for registered nurses of being able to make clinical judgements, and in line with this the importance of improving and evaluating students' clinical judgements. It would be helpful to identify a conceptual framework, or give a reference to a theoretical definition of the concept of clinical judgement.

Simulation is described as a method having positive effects on the students' learning abilities in two separate parts of the text - P2L28 to 49, and P528-58. It would be of benefit to the reader with a cohesive brief, systematic description or mental model of simulation and the use of simulated patients before providing referenced evidence of the impact on learning outcomes.

LCJR is highlighted as a validated tool developed to evaluate clinical judgement in simulation teaching. It has been translated, validated and used in different countries. The authors could highlight Benner (from novice to expert) and Tanner’s model of clinical judgement in nursing as the theoretical framework for this tool.

There are two clear aims with the study.

**METHODOLOGICAL RIGOUR**
The design of the study would appear to be appropriate. The randomization need to be further described/explained to clarify the process. Were all students in all classes included? Were there any exclusion criteria?
Measurement:
This section needs to be more thoroughly explained regarding both operationalization of the concept clinical judgement, the scoring process and the intervention (simulation).

P1L28 - "This rubric is an 11 X 4 inches". Inches as "table"?
P1L32 - "...in eleven projects". Projects as "items"?
P2L53 - Chronbach’s alpha is already presented in the Introduction section
P4L13 - "Ten competent students were randomly selected // to serve as standardized patients". How was this randomization performed? What does "competent" mean in this context?
P5L32 - "Each simulation took one hour including operation, self-evaluation, teachers' evaluation and reflection". Is the word "operation" used for scenario?

Data analysis:
The choice of analytical methods is described in detail with clear references.

P3L22 - A reflection: printing statistical formulas might create more confusion than clarity. Readers with special interests in statistics have the reference.

RESULTS
This paragraph is clearly written. The table and the figure adds information in relation to the text.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
The authors discuss their findings in relation to previous research in other contexts regarding the evaluation of the measurement properties. They also state that simulation teaching with standardized patients outperformed traditional teaching. Considering the paper’s title a more detailed discussion can be expected. However, if the title is modified (as mentioned above) the current disposition is more appropriate.

There are limitations with the study that are highlighted and discussed by the authors.

Clarity, length and Ethical approval
This paper is generally clearly written, with a few areas that require clarification or rewording. Ethical issues have been addressed and approval has been noted.
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