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Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. Consistency and validity of student assessment on clinical placement is an important topic. This paper describes a study investigating the ability of Australian clinical educators to rate the performance of standardised actors in video vignettes in four practice areas. Scripts were written by academics at one university, and validated by clinical academics from across Australia before inviting clinical educators to rate the performance on each video. The findings highlight consistency in identifying inadequate performance from adequate - which is important and may speak to the training the clinical educators receive. Difficulty seems to arise in determining the difference between adequate from good/excellent and further training in this realm may be required.

Overall this paper is well written, is clear and concise and adds an important component to this body of literature.

Pge 8 - line 66 - It is not clear to me the difference between orthopaedics and musculoskeletal. Is on in patient and the other outpatient?

Pge 8 - line 84 - in Figure 1 you state that they are clinical academics from across Australia, I think it would be good to include that here too, its speaks to the validity of your pilot.

pge 9 - line 95 - An inclusion criterion - then lists 3 criteria

Pge 13 - line 196 - I think this citation is missing a surname

Pge 16 line 268 - A is capitalised

Ref 4 and 11, I believe that the author is Van Der Vleuten in each case

Table 3 - Communication, CALD abbreviation is not written out in full

**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.

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.
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