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Dear Dr Murphy,

RE: Revisions to manuscript MEED-D-18-00907 “Rating of physiotherapy student clinical performance: Is it possible to gain assessor consistency?”

Thank you for taking the time to review our article and providing the opportunity to publish our work in BMC Medical Education. As requested we have provided a point by point response to the reviewer’s comments in the table below.
I hope that the level of detail and suggested changes meet the requirements of the journal and the manuscript can progress to publication within the BMC Medical Education Journal. If you require any additional detail or you wish to seek further clarification of any of the changes please feel free to contact me.

Thanks again for the opportunity and we look forward to having our work published in the near future.

Kind Regards,

Garry Kirwan

Corresponding author

Line number

Reviewer 1 comments (Sue Murphy)

Author Response

Line 66

Comment #1

what is the definition of "orthopedics" vs "musculoskeletal"?

Within Australia, orthopaedics is often separated from outpatient musculoskeletal as a clinical experience. The clinical case load includes the immediate post-surgical management of orthopaedic conditions. However, the reviewer makes a valid point as to how this is interpreted from a wider perspective. In order to better meet the broad readership of the journal the following amendment has been made.
Orthopaedics has been replaced with the term Inpatient Musculoskeletal throughout the manuscript and following the first use in line 66 the term orthopaedics has been included in brackets to ensure context is provided for all readers. Line 66 - 68 now reads as follows.

“Four clinical scenarios were developed in the areas of inpatient musculoskeletal (Orthopaedics), musculoskeletal, cardiopulmonary and neurological physiotherapy to simulate a student performance.”

Also, in order to differentiate all references to musculoskeletal has been prefaced with outpatient and now read “outpatient musculoskeletal”

Line 106

Comment #2

what "purposive sampling" method was used?

This is an important clarification from the reviewer and will better represent the methodology. In order to ensure the ‘adequate’ video was viewed most (as this was identified as the most critical decision) our sampling ensured that this video was selected more often that the others. Therefore to clarify it would be best defined as criterion-i purposive sampling method as defined by Palinkas et al (2015). See below for the changes that have been made to the manuscript

Line 106 – 108 now reads:

“Videos were assigned using a Criterion-i purposive sampling method, as described by Palinkas, Horwitz (9). This approach was adopted to ensure the ‘adequate’ performance was most viewed, as this was considered the critical decision when assessing student performance.

In addition the reference list has been updated to include this citation
"assessment levels" is repeated

The additional “assessment levels” has been deleted and the line now reads

“It is reasonable to conclude that when faced with a difficult decision, such as differentiating between assessment levels on the APP GRS, with limited information, participants within the current study reverted to past experience and context to influence their final decision, which may have resulted in the observed variability.”

Comment #4

The discussion section would benefit from being fleshed out a little more.

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion and at many points throughout the development of the manuscript we looked at the discussion and the level of detail included. However, at most attempts we felt that any additional contributions failed to add value to the overall manuscript and in some cases detracted.

In the end we were happy with the relatively short yet direct outcomes that the discussion distils the information into. This allows the reader to appreciate the simple yet valuable message that is attempted to be portrayed which is clinical educators are effective at differentiating not adequate from adequate or better but more work needs to be done for the differentiation of adequate to good / excellent.

If the reviewer had some specific examples that they would like to see incorporated to improve the value of the article to its readers we would be more than happy to address those thoughts.
Comment #1

It is not clear to me the difference between orthopaedics and musculoskeletal. Is one inpatient and the other outpatient?

This has been addressed above as per Reviewer 1 Comment #1 response

Comment #2

In Figure 1 you state that they are clinical academics from across Australia, I think it would be good to include that here too, it speaks to the validity of your pilot.

The reviewers comment adds strength to this sentence and as such the amendment has been made. The following has been updated in the manuscript and reads as follows

Line 85:
“A pilot study was undertaken using the final edit of each video. Clinical academics (n=16), from across Australia, experienced in applying and interpreting the APP, were recruited to evaluate each video.”

Line 95
Comment #3

An inclusion criterion - then lists 3 criteria

This has been updated to ensure grammatically correct for the plural. The sentence now reads as follows

Line 96

“The inclusion criteria for the study was at least three years clinical experience, a minimum of one year’s experience in supervising physiotherapy students and each participant must have undertaken the primary supervision of at least one student in the past 12 months.”

Line 196
Comment #4

I think this citation is missing a surname

The citation is correct in the bibliography but the referencing style for Vancouver within Endnote did not include et al. I have updated this and the highlighted reference now reads
“Cross, Hicks et al. (10) reported wide”

A is capitalised

This grammatical error has now been corrected and reads as follows

“the Queensland Physiotherapy Placement Collaborative through a grant of $25,000”

I believe that the author is Van Der Vleuten in each case

The reference has now been updated

Comment #7

I believe that the author is Van Der Vleuten in each case

The reference has now been updated


Table 3

Comment #8

Communication, CALD abbreviation is not written out in full

This has been updated and no longer abbreviated. The cell now reads

Table 3, Column Communication, Row 3

“Recognition of patient factors affecting communication

Culturally and linguistically diverse

Age

Cognition”