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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions
  nil

- Minor Essential Revisions
  1. There are a number of typographical, punctuation errors that should be checked or corrected. For example:

     a) the word ‘seminaries’ should probably be ‘seminars’ e.g. p8, p13 and in the table on p 17
     b) some commas are misplaced e.g. delete after ‘well as’ (p1, methods); insert after ‘environment’ and delete after ‘provided on both’ (both last para, p 12)
     c) insert ‘a’ before ‘needs based’ (which I would also hyphenate)
     d) insert ‘about’ or similar after ‘inquiring (p 1) and ‘inquired’ (p6)
     e) some words were not clear and should be replaced e.g. ‘workout’ on p 5 (maybe should be ‘development’); ‘carnet’ on p 5 (is this the name of the tool?); ‘cumulated’ on p 9 (perhaps should be ‘located’)
     f) ‘Practice’ (heading on p 8) should probably be ‘Practise’; similarly, ‘practiced’ on p 13 should be ‘practised’
     g) insert ‘and’ after ‘Norway’ on p 10
     h) ‘explored’ may be a better term in place of ‘inquired’ p 10, and I would suggest ‘workforce’ instead of ‘manpower’ (same page)

  2. Care should be taken to spell out abbreviations at first use; this has mostly been done, although I note ‘FM’ on p6

- Discretionary Revisions

  3. I note response rate of ~30% (p 3): perhaps a comment could be included about any strategies to increase this (e.g. follow-up reminders) and how representative this sample was of the overall resident population
  4. some of the data on p4 (e.g. participation in courses and congresses in the 5th line) does not appear to be in the table, and perhaps should be included here
  5. the term ‘affiliation ‘ perhaps could be explained more fully when first used on
6. there is no formal literature review, although parts of the literature are cited on p10-11; consideration could be given to moving some of this to the background section

7. there are several suggestions about increasing the length of components of training; the authors may want to comment on how practical it may be to increase the length of the overall training time

8. it may be worth mentioning the limitations of the study – self report, 30% sample etc

9. it may also be worth mentioning implications of the other study – further work to be un
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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