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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   I find the methods relevant and appropriate. They are thoroughly described. I would, however, suggest that the authors elaborate slightly more upon the framework approach and the choice of objectives (see below).

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes, as far as soundness can be judged concerning a qualitative approach.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes, the authors provide an abundant range of examples from the interview transcripts to support their conclusions.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Most of the relevant limitations (no of interviews, potential selection bias. Were the interviewees representative of the whole group of graduates) are mentioned and reflected upon by the authors. I might be relevant to consider the possible limitations of the framework approach as a qualitative method. How, why and by whom were the prior objectives chosen (it is stated that they relate to "Tomorrow's Doctors" but this could be elaborated)? Was saturation of themes only reached for the predefined objectives of even concerning the two "open" questions ("Strengths and weaknesses of the course" and "Anything else to add")?

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   It might be helpful if the title indicated that this paper describes an
interview-based (i.e. qualitative) study – in contrast to papers by the same authors, that deal with the first part of the "Liverpool Medical Curriculum Evaluation Project".

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes – for minor changes, see below.

Methods, paragraph 1, line 3: … a duty to be registered …

Page 10, lines 1 and 2. This sentence is unclear. Should it be "Although the majority were glad they had not had the same amount of science lectures as the students in the TMC, they would …"?

Discussion, line 1, sentence 2 should probably read: It is possible that the interviewers may have attracted people

Discussion, line 7 becomes clearer if "minimum" is added: … is more than the (commonly) accepted minimum amount …

I consider the proposed revisions to be discretionery and recommend the paper to be published.
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