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Reviewer’s report:

It appears the authors have considered all the revisions I had suggested for the article. Unfortunately the English is somewhat convoluted and difficult to read. Especially the first paragraph of the abstract which has one long sentence in it which is confusing. Here is my take on the first paragraph in the abstract:

Residents are one of the key stakeholders of specialty training in Turkey. Unfortunately, the Turkish Board of Family Medicine (TAHYK) has not obtained prior evidence on what were their residents’ opinions and views about Family Medicine specialty training. The aim of this study was to develop a realistic and structured approach in the design of the specialty training program. This approach required developing a needs-based core curriculum built on evidence obtained from residents about their needs for specialty training and their needs in the current infrastructure.

The next paragraph in abstract should also use short sentences, not punctuated with semi-colons.

The first four sentences in the methods results were very confusing. Here is what I think the authors wanted to say:

Results:
In 2005 there were an estimated 664 family medicine residents in Turkey. A total of 191 questionnaires returned gave a response rate of 29%. All respondents came from either one of the nine Ministry of Heath Hospitals (MoH) or from one of the 10 University Departments. 59% of participants were female. 85 participants (45%) proposed a duration of over three* years for residency with either extensions of standard rotation periods in pediatrics and internal medicine, or reductions in general surgery.

“It is standard procedure to write words when numbers under 10 are reported (so the authors should have written “three” instead of “3”).

The discussion is still too long. The main reason being the convoluted writing style. Example: The start of the third paragraph in the discussion:

“The residents proposed different durations for the standard rotations. While the standard duration of internal medicine and pediatrics is 9 months; nearly 70 percent of the participants proposed an extension of those rotations to 10 months and over.”
I think this should read as follows:

“The majority of participants (70%) proposed an extension of their current rotation times in internal medicine and pediatrics from nine months to over 10 months.”
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