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Reviewer's report:

1. It is a well written and well structured article with all the detailed analyses. The authors have used standardised tests for analyses which is very commendable. They have stated all the limitations of their research. This will help the readers to understand the shortcomings of the research. Please note the following suggestions and see if you can incorporate them. I congratulate you for writing such a wonderful paper. I am a coordinator for a Health Science (including medical students) student mentoring program, so I was able to relate the study well with my experience in the program.

2. No Aims and objectives explicitly written. There was an indication of the aim as part of the introduction. It may be better to show it separately.

3. There was no research question(s) and or no hypothesis.

4. The number of mentors and mentees in the pool was small and as the authors have stated the power of significance difference might be a problem.

5. All Mentees were females and the mentors were a mixed gender. I do not know whether this has any impact on the findings. Was there any specific reason for having mixed genders?

6. Mentors were selected without applying any selection criteria. It may be better if the authors can give an explanation for that.
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