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Reviewer's report:

This article needs major compulsory revisions.

This study was designed to reveal family medicine residents' views about their specialty training.

The title of the article should have included the words "In Turkey"

I found the sample frame very confusing — First we are told that there were 27 family medicine departments and 11 research hospitals that were approached. Then we are told an estimated 664 residents working in these institutions were sampled. I presume all 38 institutions responded but only 29% of residents could be reached. This is a very low response rate and invalidates any results from a population perspective. The researchers reported their response rates by 10 cities rather than by the 38 institutions they approached initially. — This is very confusing to an outsider like myself who does not know the relationship between the cities in Turkey and the 38 institutions.

The researchers presented the opinions of an unrepresentative sample of residents. I suggest the researchers should have used a purposeful sampling technique where they sampled (say) 5 residents nominated by each of the 38 institutions and worked hard with the institutions to obtain a response from each resident.

I found the writing style difficult to read and the statistics poorly presented. For example the section on the duration of the residency program (I think) was supposed to present the resident's views about the duration of their program and how it differed from what they would like. They key variable for the researchers were residents who were affiliated with MoH compared to those affiliated with a university. (The researchers should have stated that in their analyses they were going to compare these two groups using non-parametric statistics.) A similar confusion occurred in other sections of the article.

The sentence "university affiliated residents were more likely to agree with given rotation periods (50.8% of university affiliated residents n=33 vs. 38.2% of MoH affiliated residents n=47) but the difference in proportions between university And MoH affiliated residents was not significant p=0.067)."

Should have read...

"University affiliated residents were no more likely to agree with given rotation
periods than MoH affiliated residents (50.8% university vs. 38.2% MoH, p=0.067)."

Furthermore, is it meaningful to do any statistics when the sample is so unrepresentative of the general population? If a qualitative method had been used the researchers could have highlighted the range of views expressed by the residents, and the differences between what was actually happening (e.g., with length of training) and what was desired.

The tables had headings which did not match the language in the text. For example, Table 3 had a separation of primary care into "Private" and "State" — is this the same as the separation into MoH and University mentioned above?

Finally the discussion was too long. It could easily be reduced by 50%, furthermore, it is not recommended to include a "last word" in the conclusions.
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