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Reviewer's report:

I thank the authors for their revised manuscript and congratulate them on this great study! I think they have done an excellent job in responding to the comments and recommend the manuscript move forward towards publication.

I have only very minor suggestions which can likely be addressed in the copy-editing stage.

1. Abstract (Methods): "Each team completed four scenarios and was measured on 60 key tasks". Suggest changing 'was' to 'were'.

2. Results (Sample Description): "All groups had at least one doctor, with doctors on average were 51% of the group composition...". Suggest changing to "All groups had at least one doctor. Doctors made up 51% of the group composition on average, but this ranged from 25% to 100%.

3. Results (Table 2): Suggest adding a '(%)' designation to the relevant columns. This is denoted in the text preceding the table, but may be a helpful addition to reduce confusion for those readers who jump straight to the table.

4. Results (Table 4): "Overal Quality" should become "Overall Quality"

5. Discussion (Value of cognitive aids): "Marshall concluded in a systematic literature review that most studies focussed on ...". Suggest changing focussed to focused.

6. Discussion (last paragraph): I noticed there was a period missing in the first sentence, and the citation for reference 19 should be moved to after the period.
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