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Reviewer's report:

Again, I find this paper to include some interesting insights and useful information for those working in the area of clinical reasoning curricula, and I feel that educators will be interested in the techniques and results described. I appreciate the authors' response to feedback and addition of a Limitations section, as well as clarifying details about the study groups throughout (e.g. being more clear about who are truly being compared), and including additional supplementary materials in the manuscript. The language overall has also improved and is easier to follow. However, more work is needed to add additional clarity to the writing in some sections as I still often found myself tripping over the wording and having to re-read certain sections several times to be sure I was clear on the authors' points. I have made comments mainly as sticky notes (and occasional strike-thru's) on the attached manuscript describing my suggestions to improve the clarity of the manuscript further.

There are also a number of places where I believe the authors should soften their language/claims to more closely match the data this set of linked studies provides. In particular, in the limitations section, I am struck by the fact that the differential response rate is in fact a real issue, and the additional references which have been added regarding general response rates and differences between responders and non-responders in internet surveys, feel inadequate to explain away the limitation related to the differential response rates in this study. I think it would be preferable to simply acknowledge this limitation, and to suggest that future study is needed, rather than attempting to allay the relevant concerns these differential response rates bring up. That said, in contrast, the data showing the similarity between those who did and did not complete the final assessment (which is now highlighted in the limitations section) is more compelling and useful for readers.

Finally, after this read, I am still unclear exactly how the post-assessment worked (the language makes me unsure whether these were one-on-one verbal assessments vs. group assessments), and feel this part of the study would warrant more description/specifcics. Depending on how this part
of the study was shaped, I am also imagining discussion of additional limitations may be warranted.

I hope my comments throughout the paper are helpful. While I have pointed out a number of places that need attention, I would additionally suggest finding a reader with expertise in style/grammar to review the paper before resubmission.

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

Yes

**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.

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.

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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