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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
The authors have listed all seven of these from my original review, responded to each and where applicable have made changes.

Minor Essential Revisions:
Again the authors have listed all twelve of these and addressed them where and as appropriate. But there are three others that the authors might easily address:

1. Page 2, Abstract: Mention is made of results being concluded using logistic regression analysis. As a logistic regression analysis focuses on the association between dependent and independent variables, it would be helpful to detail all of the variables in this study. Specifically, because there are several confounding factors (such as gender and harassment), I think it is important for the authors to explain why variables were designated as either “dependent” or “independent” in this study.

2. Page 4, Lines 14 to 15 (“Control over one’s own work schedule”): This phrase is mentioned, but it is never clearly defined. Does this mean that the physician chooses the hours of their schedule or the difficulty of work during their scheduled hours? This is important when addressing the suicidal ideations of these physicians.

3. Page 5, Lines 4 to 5 (“The lifetime prevalence of suicidal thoughts among medical students re-examined after the first post-graduate year was found to be 43.1%”)
Mention is made of ‘lifetime’ prevalence, however there is no statistical mention of suicidality and suicidal thoughts for med school students prior to entering residency. On a similar note, it would be interesting to explore whether this ‘lifetime’ statistic could differentiate between those physicians in residency and those who have specialized, especially since it is difficult to ascertain the exact time period of the suicidal ideations.

Discretionary Revisions:
The authors have paid heed to several of these.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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