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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors, firstly I would like to congratulate you for the great job that you have done with improving the manuscript! The readability is great, clarity improved, the limitations are now adequately reported, and the overall appeal of the paper is very good.

Before I dig into point-by-point review: it would have been much easier to review your R2 version if you had attached the response to reviewers point by point. I can only see a short sentence in response to reviewers, two versions of the file marked with track changes and one clean version. Nevertheless, I have done my best to review the changes made in this format in order to speed up your publication process.

Point-by-point review:

MAJOR:

1. Title issues: I acknowledge the changes made which now balance the authors tendency to keep the acronym in the title with the improved searchability of their paper. Resolved

2. resolved in previous revision

3. resolved in previous revision

NEW:

4. Sample size problems: mostly resolved

MINOR:

1. ABSTRACT: adequately improved. I only suggest some minor changes in one sentence if authors would agree (I think this can be changed at the proofreading stage and does not require another round of revisions):
Moreover, there is not a universal tool which can be utilised across several healthcare student groups and placement settings.

In addition, there is no universal tool available which could be utilised across several healthcare student groups and placement settings.

2. BACKGROUND: is adequately improved.

3. METHODS: adequately improved. Just make sure at the proofreading stage that the order of Figures starts with 1 in the manuscript text (if I am not mistaken, see Figure 3 for overview appears first).

3a. resolved
3b. resolved
3c. resolved
3d. resolved in previous revision
3e. resolved in previous revision
3f. resolved in previous revision
3g. resolved in previous revision
3h. resolved in previous revision

4. RESULTS: adequately improved. I suggest omitting the "see" in reference to Figures/tables/supplementary data. It is redundant (again, this can be corrected at the proofreading stage).

4a. resolved in previous revision
4b. mostly resolved
4c. resolved in previous revision
4d. mostly resolved

4f. resolved in previous revision

5. DISCUSSION: adequately improved. I suggest reconsidering at the proof-reading stage whether you could omit the word "potentially" in the limitations paragraph.

5a. resolved in previous revision

5b. mostly resolved

5c. mostly resolved

5d. resolved in previous revision

5e. resolved in previous revision

Once again, congratulations on your work!
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