Reviewer’s report

Title: Identifying factors which enhance capacity to engage in clinical education among podiatry practitioners: an action research project

Version: 3 Date: 1 June 2015

Reviewer: Cylie Williams

Reviewer’s report:

Thank you to the authors for the great improvement to the manuscript. It has greatly improved the readability.

Major Revisions:
Abstract: As you still have enough words within the limit. I would suggest you include how you have analysed your data.

Introduction: From the paragraph: Capacity and capacity-building in clinical education onwards, there are multiple references to nursing clinical supervisor capacity. While this is important, there is nothing within these paragraphs directly relating why and how this relates to podiatry clinical supervising capacity. Even a statement suggesting that there are synergies between nursing and podiatry training capacity (which I would suggest are tenuous) you need to better link these two concepts. This is especially the case as often there are different ratios between supervisors therefore capacity may be different, for example nursing 1:6 and podiatry 1:2 supervisor to student ratios. I suspect the inclusion of this information about nursing is due to the same tool being analysed within nursing placements however there is a good deal of research supporting that. Not so in podiatry and this needs to be presented.

The information contained under the Conceptual Framework heading appears disjointed and would be best linked to the information preceding it. While I understand why the authors have included this, I would encourage them to present the concept of capacity building and how it relates to the education to podiatry students more succinctly in order to better engage the reader in the concept. Authors should consider removing this heading, and rephrasing just the key points or even just minimizing it to the last paragraph and figure 1.

Minor Essential Revisions:
Abstract:
There are results within the methods section - please move to the results.
There is inconsistency in p value presentation with some with and some without a 0 before the decimal.

There are often capitals on words that do not require capitalisation ie: Higher Education and Higher Education Institution. Please amend throughout the
The CECE is used within the text without first spelling it out. Careful in the use of word validate, if you only reporting Cronbach's alpha of the CECE, then you have measured the reliability/internal consistency, not the validity.

first line page 6: extant?
end of page 12: softWare, also remove SPSS as it is not needed.

Table 1: As you have introduced your levels of significances within the manuscript, rather than text, I would suggest you just list the p value.

I will leave the references that still require changing to the editors for suggestion.

**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
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