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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

1 I believe there is great value in brevity. Although well written this paper is long, and exceeds the normal length of time that the average reader of a scientific article would want to take.

The figures including a discretionary revision below and table are good. Therefore I think you should be set a 1500 word limit to this paper for the text excluding abstract and references.

2 I don't think you need a summary as well as an abstract.

3 You need to state at the outset what the official view is of the Association of Surgeons in Training is. Who authorised this review, has it been adopted or endorsed, or is the perspective only that of the authors?

The figures and table have been included twice. This is probably an upload problem and I am sure will be sorted in the final version.

Discretionary Revisions

The figure 2 may be more intelligible as a table with numbers of the various representatives rather than a graph in which one struggles to interpret the colours and "pattern"

Have the views expressed or any earlier versions of this perspective been discussed by Surgical bodies, Associations or Colleges. This would be interesting to hear

This paper was first submitted to BMC Surgery in October 2013. As I write this review in August 2014 what has changed and is there a need to revisit the subject matter of this paper, particularly with regards to the data it quotes. There is little value in raising concerns if some of them have already been addressed, or at least this needs to be said.

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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