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Reviewer's report:

Page 5 - please be specific as to what literature was reviewed for the scale. Presumably literature on giving feedback on OSCE performance but should be specified other than saying "the literature".

Page 5 - I am not sure what "consensus of faculties" means. I assume it should be reworded to be something like "based on the consensus of faculty members in the department of medical education. Also who were these faculty members? Were any of them actually qualified to be judging feedback in an OSCE? A bit more detail around the qualification of the judges is needed.

Page 5 mentions a consensus method is used and Page 7 mentions a conventional Delphi. The problem is that the Delphi method means many different things so it needs to be described in a bit more detail. (See work recent work by Susan Humphrey-Murto on consensus methods). When I look at page 7, additional information needed includes, how were the items sent out, how many items were sent out, what was the response rate, and how was consensus defined.

Statistical analysis - I am holding firm on not using the term marginally significant for two reasons. First, if I wanted to be a purist, there are actually 20 comparisons so the p-value should be corrected for the family-wise error rate and be .05/20= .0025. It is an exploratory study to some degree so one could argue for keeping the p-value at .05 but given that the p-value should actually be considerably lower, there is no justification for discussing questions in which the p-value is between .05 and .10. Second, while I thank the authors for adding in effect sizes, I note that they are all small. A p-value between .05 and .10 combined with a small effect size indicates to me that there is nothing there of interest. I think just pointing out that all the means are higher and then focusing on the subset that is statistically significant and not marginal is advisable.
Upon re-reading this version, table 2 and 3 triggered a thought. There is a paper by Kruger and Dunning on self assessment. They showed that people who were good performers tended to rate their performance lower than they should have and people who were poor performers tended to rate their performance higher than they should have. I am curious if the people who disagreed with the result were all poor performers. Presumably they are and I think having a look and reporting on this provides an interesting link to a major finding in self assessment. I wish I had clued in on this pattern on the first read.

With regards to table 2 and 3, on page 8 there is a comment that the tables show a change in perception. This terminology could be more specific, the tables actually show the number or frequency of people who did not agree with their feedback.

Finally, I found some of the text, especially the new revisions to have some awkward wording. It might be of benefit to run the manuscript by an English grammar editor before final publication.
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