Dear Editor,

We have been pleased to incorporate the reviewers’ comments and feedback as we all agree they have strengthened the report of our work. The specific comments against each point are presented below.

Yours faithfully,

Keri Moore

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer B: |  |
| I note that in a short report there should be a maximum of 10 references and 1 figure or table. Whilst the authors have used current research, there are too many references (12) and 2 figures/tables have been used. This will need to be reduced to meet the journal guidelines. | Two references have been removed with out losing the report of scholarly approach to the tool development process and to clarity outcomes. One Figure has been removed and absorbed in the text in the appropriate place |
| In the introduction Paragraph 1, the authors discuss assessment of procedural skills in podiatry. It is not clear if the pDOPS also assesses other essential skills for clinical practice, e.g. patient/client communication, WHS skills, task prioritisation skills. It would be of benefit to briefly discuss how these skills are measured. You could direct them for example to Appendix 1 which shows the range of skills assessed during pDOPS. | We thank the reviewer for identifying this matter and have clarified that the pDOPs assesses the application of student’s procedural skills. The discussion of how other skills could be assessed is outside the scope of the paper. |
| Methods, paragraph 3, line 1. 'Clinical supervisors were invited to individual interviews'. I am aware that this is a short report but I was wondering what kinds of questions were asked. Was it a semi-structured interview or did you ask specific questions. There are obviously word constraints but if there was room you could just provide a sentence or two about this and the specific type of information you were wanting to receive | Examples of questions asked have now been included |
| Results - paragraph 1, line 1. I would give some information about who the learners are - you have mentioned earlier that they are senior learners, what year group are they in, e.g. is it 4th year students or 3rd year students? You could also direct the reader to Appendix 1 where the year groups are mentioned. | This information has been added |
| Discussion - paragraph 1, line 3. I was wondering what were the previous measures used to assess a student's clinical placement development? | Clarified the previous assessment strategy |
| Conclusion - paragraph 1, line 6, is the cost in this case just the assessor's time? | Clarified that the costs are supervisors/assessors time spent undertaking the assessment |
| In Figure 1, there is a category called 'other' - what kinds of things does this involve? | We added  *This could involve any other type of podiatric skill that is not accounted for in the other sections, for example “xray evaluation”* |
| Reviewer C |  |
| Abstract would allow for clearer reading if it were structured with the same subheadings as within the full text. This would also ensure that information needed in the abstract is not missed. | This has been adjusted |
| The introduction is generally well written with the general context of the research (used of DOPS) is clearly outlined and well linked to previous research. However, the local context of the article (DOPS in podiatry) needs to be highlighted more. Additionally, the aims of the research need to be more clearly articulated. | Local context explained and the aims have now been clarified. |
| More depth required for the methods section, as currently it would not be possible to replicate this study. | Methods have been clarified to ensure the study would be replicable |
| Results section needs to follow what has been outlined in the methods. Currently, it is unclear how the pDOPs progressed from the original iteration to the final iteration, as the results only outline the final iteration and it’s usage, even though the full process is outlined in the methods. Use of quotes within the results section supported your overall findings well. | Results section has been adapted as advised |
| Discussion/Conclusion requires better link to previous research. Areas for future research have been very clearly outlined. However, limitations of the research have not been provided. | Now included |
| Title – Need to explain purpose of the study more. Add ‘ Development of a tool for ....’ | Title amended |
| Abstract - Page 4, 2nd sentence – this particular sentence should not be in the abstract. | Sentence removed |
| Abstract – Results and Conclusion should be added to the abstract | Added |
| Introduction  - Page 5, 1st paragraph - Local context of why work-based assessment and direct observation of procedural skills is important in podiatry needs to be highlighted more. Specifically, it’s role in professional registration requirements for podiatry and accreditation requirements for podiatry degrees. | Clarified |
| Introduction – Page 6, Paragraph 1 – Aims need to be more clearly articulated: 1) development of pDOPS, 2) conduct pilot testing of developed pDOPS to determine construct validity, etc. | These have been clarified |
| Methods – Page 7, Paragraph 2 – More information needed about how the focus groups and interviews were conducted. How long did they go for? Were they semi-structured? | Now included |
| Methods – Page 7, Paragraph 2 – Were the interview responses included in the qualitative analysis? | Amended |
| Results – Page 8 – Need to include brief explanation of the changes that occurred from iteration 1 to iteration 2 to iteration 3 to show the progression from beginning to end. | Now included |
| Results – Page 8, Paragraph 2 – the sentence ‘Based on these figures…’ would fit better in the discussion. | That point has been reallocated to the discussion section |
| Discussion – Page 9/10 – Sentence ‘This implementation has enabled …’ is not really necessary to include. | This sentence has been removed |
| Discussion – Page 10, Paragraph 3 – What is written is true but needs to be better clarified. Explain more why work-based assessment feedback is good for students, in all contexts (for improvement and to meet professional standards | We added:  *Work based assessment feedback is an essential process to ensure the delivery of consistently high quality education within the academic and clinical setting. The pDOPS offers a time efficient process through which clinical skills can be reviewed with both internal and external accreditation requirements in mind.* |
| Conclusion – Page 10, Paragraph 4 – Need to explain why the changes to the iterations were made. | Clarified |
| Conclusion – Limitations to the conducted research need to be included. | Now included |
| Figure 1 – explanation of figure needed – Was it clinical assessment or peer assessment or combination that is shown? Could multiple procedures have happened in the one consultation? | Removed |