

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_130979
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical Reasoning Assessment Tool (CRAT) for Preclinical Medical Students: a validation study.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>Reviewer Comments on Clinical Reasoning Assessment Tool (CRAT) for Preclinical Medical Students: a validation study.</p> <p>It's an interesting research work. However, I would like to highlight some concerns</p> <p>1.The questionnaire and methodology is not aligned with the title of the study. The inclusion of questions assessing self-confidence in the Clinical Reasoning Assessment questionnaire needs to be justified.</p> <p>2. The reason to use different measures to assess accuracy in clinical reasoning (MEQ, SEQ, MCQ) and self-confidence (Likert scale) is not clear.</p> <p>3. Rationale for choosing a sample of 7 medical residents and 7 clinical year students (4 th Year medical students) for validation of Clinical Reasoning Assessment Tool needs to be included as the questionnaire is meant for assessing the clinical reasoning and self-confidence of pre-clinical students (target population).</p> <p>4.A sample size of only 14 students for the pilot test is considered inadequate for statistical analysis. It is suggested that authors quote a reference to justify the chosen sample size for this validation study.</p> <p>5. The number of experts for pre-test is also inadequate. Authors can quote a reference to justify why only 3 experts were recruited for the content validation.</p> <p>6. In the result section, the interpretation of the study's Cronbach's alpha value is 'good'. It is suggested to remove 'excellent'.</p> <p>7. The typo error in p value (Table 2) needs to be corrected.</p> <p>Best regards</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. We included self-confidence questions as this capability can influence clinical reasoning result. We accept and we are modifying this it in the text, with corrections in the title and questionnaire sigla.2. The use of different accuracy measures is described in the references Daniel (15) and Cate (21). We included self-confidence questions as this capability can influence clinical reasoning result., After this review we explained this in the methodology text.3. We explained this in the method section after this review4. We explained this in the method section after this review5. Reference quoted (23).6. Removed7. Thanks for reviewing this, we corrected

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	