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Reviewer's report:

Thanks you to the author and team for the preparation of this manuscript. It is valuable to understand the motivators for clinicians for providing clinical supervision.

Major Revisions:

I found that this paper while valuable, incredibly wordy and in many parts unnecessarily repetitive. This distracts greatly from the message and make it hard for the reader to follow.

I believe there are a number of key changes that are required for this article to be published:

1. There is disparity between the abstract and the article. Within the article there is results presented on the development and validity of the scale however this is not discussed within the abstract.

2. The aim of "to validate the CECE scale further" should be clarified. Validate further in what way? The authors discuss reliability and then presents results for item correlations, this should have been done prior to reliability and in the current way it is written I am confused as to how this scale was developed. I have re-read the scale development sections a number of times, these sections need to be written much clearer about order and methods. I would suggest that this paper would be improved if the development and validation of the tool was actually in a separate paper and this paper was simply about the results.

3. Within the methodology, the authors present another aim about using the scale. This is in the wrong part of the manuscript and contradicts the aims in the introduction.

4. Results are presented within the methodology - please put the results of sample within the results.

5. From the table and results section a forward stepwise regression model was used, this should be further described within the analysis.

6. Hypothesis testing section should be condensed into a table with non-significant results for improved readability.

7. I would encourage the use of only "Assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity were met overall" rather than the full paragraph about
assumptions. This paragraph is appropriate for a thesis however does not add to the article.

8. The discussion length and content is appropriate but disparate to the length of the article. There is nothing within the discussion about the scale results other than what they measures. Again, this suggests that the scale development should be removed from the article and placed in separate manuscript. What the future plans for the scale? Is there going to be Rasch analysis, use with other populations (ie: Allied health - physio's OT?).

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. Please list which organisation and university granted ethics
2. Ambiguity within recruitment: where the participants or the heads of departments offered prizes?
3. What statistical package was used to analyse the data
4. The limitations should be included within the discussion and not the conclusion
5. Future directions should also be included within the discussion and not the conclusion.
6. The introduction of many non-standard abbreviations should be avoided due to unfamiliarity by the reader and limited only to the tool or those commonly known to an international readership ie: NHS and UK

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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