

## Peer Review: Further development of the reflective practice questionnaire

	Para, Line number	Issue for consideration
1	Results subheading	the reflective practice means for the updated RPQ were found to be.. Sentence is unclear. Consider rewording
2	Line 33	Consider adding in the 'two' general measures of reflection, to help guide the reader (as noted in the methods paragraph above)
3	Line 35	the reflective practice means for the updated RPQ were found to be... Sentence is unclear. Consider rewording
4	Line 47	Add comma after 'with 40 items across 10 subscales..'
5	Line 79	Consider removing 'both' as 'alongside' is used later in the sentence
6	Line 80	Consider removing capital D in Desire for improvement
7	Line 85/86	Consider removing the last sentence as examples are then provided in the next paragraph
8	Line 102	Add 'an' after part of.. evaluation of teaching methods
9	Line 101-117	The purpose of including these studies is unclear – can this be better related to the aims of the study?
10	Line 149	Consider rewording. Can be considered separable is unclear, is this intended to be can it be used as a separate and different measure?
11	Line 151	Consider rewording this sentence, it is somewhat unclear
12	Line 205	Numeric 3 is missing

13	Line 235	Some of the wording leads the reader to believe the removal of items are more based on convenience (desiring a 10 item scale as opposed to a 12 item scale) than good evidence. Consider changing words like we "noticed" (235),
14	Line 237	Sentence is unclear "we decided on removal of the other self appraisal item about weaknesses to leave remaining.."
15	Line 237-238	The justification needs to be clearer for removing this item. Statistically the factor loading for this item is higher than one other item (15) from this subscale that was that was left in the 10 items. As the aim of Reflective Practice is also primarily one of learning, clinically, item 14 appears important, hence the decision to remove it better substantiated.
16	Line 232 - 240	The reduction from 12 to 10 items appears arbitrary, particularly with the explanation provided, of 10 items being more easily divisible.
17	Line 248	Can you provide research that supports this? Studies that have omitted this scale or found it unhelpful? Consider that this statement sounds arbitrary as it stands
18	Line 307	Change "Additionally" to additional
19	Line 322	I had to read this paragraph several times to understand your rationale behind the

		change of terminology. It appears that your rationale is that how much someone reflects on their thoughts and behaviours, is easier to responds to compared to how much they engage in reflective practice. I agree, this is the case, but consider changing line 321/322 to “how often they reflect on their thoughts and behaviours”.
20	Lines 316-321	The above rationale does not appear to necessarily lend itself to changing the response options from the initial 6 point scale - not at all – extremely, to very rarely – almost always. Consider clarifying paragraph
21	Lines 334-335	See point number 16, above
22	Lines 370, 378	Consider changing use of the word “argue”
23	Line 400	Remove the word “from”
24	Tables	Check numbering on all tables. Numbers 1, 2 and 3 appear randomly above and below tables. Unclear what this relates to.

This is a great development in the field and will be particularly useful with clinical samples to assess ongoing effectiveness of reflective sessions, as a brief measure of reflective capacity. I will certainly consider how I can build this into ongoing evaluation of reflective sessions. The introduction and rationale is sound. It is also great to have been able to derive a single score measure. The comparison of the RPQ in this article, with other measures of reflection is also very helpful. Thank you for publishing this body of work!