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Reviewer's report:

Mortensen et al. describe the results of a questionnaire survey concerning the impact of a specialist reform on the daily clinical training practice in the North Denmark region. They compare the results before and after 2.5 years after implementation.

Overall, this is a well designed and well written paper which is of interest for the medical education community.

I have only few suggestions for improvement, which are minor essential revisions:

Title:

The title might be misinterpreted. Therefore I suggest changing the title in the following respect:

“What is the impact of a national postgraduate medical specialist reform on the daily clinical training 3.5 years after implementation? Results of a questionnaire survey in the North Denmark region”

Abstract: methods section. The reform should be shortly described as done in the methods section of the article so that the reader get a feeling what it is all about: e.g. “change of content and format of PGME in line with outcome-based education using the CanMED’S framework”.

Methods: page 6: It should be described how the questionnaire was developed and whether or not validated and if how.

Page 6: Context of study: A link or publication should be given for the reader who is more interested in this reform.

Discussion:

Page 13, line:7: It should be explicitly stated that it is a limitation of the study, that the instrument used in this survey is not validated and in the following argued that it seems valid as it corresponds well with the highest rated PHEEM items, as it is already done...

Page 13 line 11: In the sentence: “The questionnaire has been used”: It should be clarified which questionnaire is meant: the PHEEM or the one used in this study...
**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.