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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions-
The authors comment in their discussion that the high response rate suggests that trainees will respond to non-anonymous survey. This is listed under a 'strength'. In fact, due to the directive given by the program director to complete the survey, even though it was not compulsory, trainees most likely felt they were required to participate. This is evidenced by the fact that the response rate was equal to the mandatory survey. It should be listed as a limitation, not just for struggling trainees, but all trainees are likely to minimize problems in a non-anonymous survey that they feel their responses will be somehow linked to them (even if they are told that they are deidentified at some point). Since the point of this approach is to develop or inform quality, it is critical that accurate feedback is attained.

The authors did not explain why their methods (which are costly and time consuming) were chosen as opposed to adding specific items to the existing national survey. Perhaps this study was designed to identify suitable domains for future surveys. As an exploratory study this paper is solid but greater clarity on purpose is needed. Adding implications for future research would strengthen the paper.
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