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BMC. Interprofessional assessment of medical student competencies. This is an interesting study. It could be helpful to others attempting to assess interprofessional competency. There are a few aspects that are not entirely clear and would benefit from some editing.

Abstract.

In methods, might you identify the 7 competencies? In results, you have provided information about the nurse correlation of competence with confidence but not for residents. For supervisors, might you identify which two competencies were correlated with confidence? In conclusions, it seems that the final sentence (Rating confidence) goes beyond the study findings. I wonder if it might be more appropriate to summarize the key findings related to the two aims of the study in Conclusions.

Page 2, line 61 and 64 should be competencies, not competences.

Background.

The literature review is helpful and comprehensive.

The aim as expressed at the end of the introduction seems inconsistent with the description in the abstract and what was done in the actual study. Would it be more accurate to say that the aim of the study was to (1) compare the ratings provided on different competencies by three different assessor groups and (2) assess the association between the scores on the assessed competencies and the confidence in judgement by the three assessor groups?

Methods.

Did the actual instrument consist of 7 items? Or were there multiple items used to explore each of the competencies? Could the actual instrument be provided? It appears there was a lot of discussion (ie, training on how to use the instrument) and it would be useful to have the salient details of what was to be assessed included (beyond the 7 competencies as listed on pages 6 and 7 (lines 154 - 157).
Can you clarify what you mean by ’discuss their judgements of situations in movies to build shared mental models? (page 7, lines 165-166).

What do you mean by semester 10? (page 7, line 170)

Can you explain what the effect size calculation was intended to do and why it is necessary in addition to the p-values associated with the ANOVA and Bonferroni post-hoc test.

Results.
For the internal consistency (α), the results should be provided without a comment on whether it was satisfactory or not. Are you not providing the internal consistency of the instrument by group?

Confidence of judgement is presented as a figure. Given the types of analyses you described, would it not make more sense to provide the confidence information in a table format. It might be included in Table 1 or as a separate table. You can then proceed to table 2 (as described on page 9, lines 210-215).

Discussion.
In the discussion, I would recommend that you go back to the aims for the study. Do some editing related to the key findings for each aim and then discuss the aims in conjunction with the broader literature.

For limitations, consider whether your sample sizes were large enough to do the calculations and draw the conclusions that you did? I wondered whether the limitations as described were actually implications for future studies.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**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.

No
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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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