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Dear Dr. Boy

BMC Oral Health

The Graduate Entry Generation: a qualitative study exploring the factors influencing the career expectations and aspirations of a graduating cohort of graduate entry dental students

Thank you for your email (dated 24 February, 2011) attaching the reviewers’ comments. We have had the time to read their comments and to suitably revise the manuscript. As a result, the paper is now much clearer, so we would like to thank the reviewers for the time and attention they have paid to our work. Their comments have been addressed as follows:

Reviewer One noted: Parts of the abstract are unclear and require clarification.

Abstract
The abstract has been revised grammatically,
Reviewer One noted: A number of assumptions are made regarding knowledge about European situations, however, being an international journal, these require explanation.

We have added descriptions of aspects such as Units of Dental Activity and the European Time Directive to clarify these features of the UK health system (see pgs 16/17 and 15 respectively).

The Graduate Entry Programme in the context of other countries and professions (see pp 4-5).

Reviewer One noted: There are a number of grammatical errors throughout the paper that require correction, and reviewer two also commented on this:

We have addressed typos and made any other minor revisions to improve the flow of the paper.

Reviewer One noted: More explanation is required of the process used to analyse data.

The methodological section on analysis has been expanded and describes the process of analysis (framework analysis) in detail (see p.7).

Reviewer One noted: Need to ensure that all claims made are supported by appropriate evidence. There are a number of conclusions drawn that do not have supporting data. Some quotes are quite lengthy and difficult to follow in places. Consider editing these.

We have endeavoured to make clearer links between conclusions and supporting data. Quotes have been provided with orientating preambles.

Discussion

Reviewer One noted: The discussion section needs to be broadened out with findings considered in the bigger picture provided by relevant literature. Currently, it reiterates what is presented in the findings section. It would be useful to examine the findings of this study in the context of literature on graduate entry programs across other disciplines. Need to draw some conclusions about graduate entry programs and recommendations for these.

We have revised the discussion section showing the work relates to other studies in the area and across professions, drawing conclusions and adding salient recommendations. We also recommend that the study area could benefit from longitudinal studies following graduate entry students into practice.

We thank you for this opportunity to resubmit this paper and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,
Dr Jennifer Gallagher on behalf of the author team
Mr Paul Newton
Dr Lyndon Cabot
Professor Naim Wilson