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Reviewer's report:

General issues:
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Mostly - please see comments under discretionary revisions
3. Are the data sound?
   Mostly – please see comments under the minor essential revisions section
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
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   yes
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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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?
   yes
9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Not always – please see comments under the minor essential revisions section

- Major Compulsory Revisions
   None

- Minor Essential Revisions

Reference Question 3:
a) according to figure one and the text 37 mentees completed the survey at 6 months and 30 at one year, but in table 1 the n=33 for 6 months and n= 27 for 1 year – please explain.

Reference Question 9:
a) Second paragraph under the background section: first sentence – please provide the meaning of the abbreviations. Second sentence - would the word female not fit better than women?
b) First paragraph under the section on Data Collection needs rewording and correct use of commas.
c) First paragraph under the section on Quantitative measures (job satisfaction) needs rewording.
d) Second paragraph under the section on Quantitative measures (job-related will-being), last sentence needs rewording.
e) First paragraph under the section on Qualitative measures, first sentence needs commas.
f) First paragraph under the Analysis, Quantitative measures section – first sentence needs revision.

- Discretionary Revisions

Reference Question 2:
a) It would be helpful to be a bit clearer in the first paragraph of the section on study participants. It is unclear whether all female academic staff of senior lecturer level or below and with a contract of at least 1 year was seen as potential mentees, or where there other criteria by which you identified them? Maybe just change the wording of the last sentence.
b) Second paragraph – was the mentees identified and after that the mentors or were the process simultaneous? When did the mentees get a chance to nominate a mentor – before or after inclusion in the study?
c) Third paragraph – is there a difference between a mentor and a senior mentor as being referred to?
d) Forth paragraph – who did the training and supervision?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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