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The BMC Medical Education Editorial Team

Re: Manuscript ID 8263603689935756-Characteristic profiles among students and junior doctors with specific career preferences

Dear BMC Medical Education Editorial Team,

The authors appreciated the further reviewer comment of Professor Fred C.J Stevens for his further comment on our manuscript:

I understand your response but if you include students and junior doctors in your sample then the report on the comparison of these groups is appropriate here, and not only interesting for a future paper

We do agree with Professor Stevens that comparison between students and junior doctors is essential, and therefore, we would like to analyse our data in depth.

To rigorously study how the preference would change as years progress from preclinical years (Year 4 students) to clinical years (Year 6 students) or difference between medical students and residents, we are currently preparing a manuscript using multivariate logistic regression analysis focusing on the preference toward certain specialties as outcome variables and choosing the five factors described in the submitted manuscript and other variables in the questionnaire such as gender as explanatory variables.

Our manuscript is already close to 5000 words excluding references. In order to maintain the focus of specialty difference in this manuscript, we would like to discuss the detailed results of comparison in future. Hence, we added the statement (underlined) in the limitation section as follows:

Further research concurrently analysing demographic variables obtained in this survey would be helpful to identify medical school applicants with interests in a certain specialty. Comparison between students and junior doctors also would be imperative to elucidate changes in perceptions and attitudes with clinical exposures. Those findings could be used to formulate effective interventions at enrolment and during further education to build workforce in need.

We hope our manuscript will benefit readers and the change we made this time sufficiently implies the importance of further study comparing medical students and residents.

Thank you very much for your time in advance.

Best regards,

Yuko Takeda, MD PhD FACP MSc