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 and1 figure or table. Whilst the authors have used current research, there aretoo many references (12) and 2 figures/tables have been used. This will needto 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 ofprocedural skills in podiatry. It is not clear if the pDOPS also assessesother essential skills for clinical practice, e.g. patient/clientcommunication, WHS skills, task prioritisation skills. It would be ofbenefit to briefly discuss how these skills are measured. You could directthem for example to Appendix 1 which shows the range of skills assessedduring 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 toindividual interviews'. I am aware that this is a short report but I waswondering what kinds of questions were asked. Was it a semi-structuredinterview or did you ask specific questions. There are obviously wordconstraints but if there was room you could just provide a sentence or twoabout 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 thelearners 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 yearstudents?You could also direct the reader to Appendix 1 where the year groups arementioned. | This information has been added  |
| Discussion - paragraph 1, line 3. I was wondering what were the previousmeasures 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 theassessor'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 doesthis 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 samesubheadings as within the full text. This would also ensure that informationneeded in the abstract is not missed. | This has been adjusted |
| The introduction is generally well written with the general context of theresearch (used of DOPS) is clearly outlined and well linked to previousresearch. However, the local context of the article (DOPS in podiatry) needsto be highlighted more. Additionally, the aims of the research need to bemore clearly articulated. | Local context explained and the aims have now been clarified.  |
| More depth required for the methods section, as currently it would not bepossible 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 originaliteration to the final iteration, as the results only outline the final iteration and it’s usage, even though the full process is outlined in themethods. 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 forfuture research have been very clearly outlined. However, limitations of theresearch have not been provided. | Now included |
| Title – Need to explain purpose of the study more. Add ‘ Development ofa tool for ....’ | Title amended |
| Abstract - Page 4, 2nd sentence – this particular sentence should not bein 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-basedassessment and direct observation of procedural skills is important inpodiatry needs to be highlighted more. Specifically, it’s role inprofessional registration requirements for podiatry and accreditationrequirements for podiatry degrees. | Clarified  |
| Introduction – Page 6, Paragraph 1 – Aims need to be more clearlyarticulated: 1) development of pDOPS, 2) conduct pilot testing of developedpDOPS to determine construct validity, etc. | These have been clarified |
| Methods – Page 7, Paragraph 2 – More information needed about how thefocus groups and interviews were conducted. How long did they go for? Werethey semi-structured? | Now included |
| Methods – Page 7, Paragraph 2 – Were the interview responses included inthe qualitative analysis? | Amended  |
| Results – Page 8 – Need to include brief explanation of the changes thatoccurred from iteration 1 to iteration 2 to iteration 3 to show theprogression from beginning to end. | Now included |
| Results – Page 8, Paragraph 2 – the sentence ‘Based on thesefigures…’ 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 tobe better clarified. Explain more why work-based assessment feedback is goodfor students, in all contexts (for improvement and to meet professionalstandards | 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 tothe 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 orpeer assessment or combination that is shown? Could multiple procedures havehappened in the one consultation? | Removed  |