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**Reviewer’s report:**

I would like to thank the authors for considering my suggestions for improvement of their paper.

Overall I'm satisfied with their response and I think the paper in its current form will make a valuable contribution to the field.

Some more specific comments:

- Regarding my remark on expertise: It was not my intention at all to suggest any further analyses regarding expertise. I just wanted to make the authors aware of the fact that experience per se does not lead to less bias (see eg. Highhouse, S. (2008). Stubborn reliance on intuition and subjectivity in employee selection. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1, 333-342; Dipboye, R.L., & Jackson, S.L. (1999). Interviewer experience and expertise effects. In R.W. Eder, & M.M. Harris (Eds.), The employment interview handbook (pp. 229-292). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage). However, I am satisfied with the current phrasing of the issue.

- Regarding my comment on the reliability of the mark sheet: I have the feeling that we are still talking about different things here. As far as I'm aware the table at the bottom op page 24 does not contain the communication and knowledge scores, but it contains the median ratings of similarity of communication and of knowledge as perceived by the 8 clinical educators who were recruited to review the videos. So I was referring to the fact that apparently these 8 clinical educators differed more in their opinion of the similarity of the (pairs of) videos with respect to communication than with respect to knowledge. For example, for performance 3 there was at least one educator who rated the similarity between the two videos as only fairly similar (2), whereas all educators rated the similarity of knowledge as completely or nearly identical. Therefore I wondered whether this difference in median ratings of similarity could somehow have influenced the findings of the current study. However, I don't want to make a great issue of this, I just wanted to try to clarify my point once more.

- I am satisfied with the responses to my other comments and I am glad that my smaller remark turned out to be particularly useful.
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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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal