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Reviewer’s report:

Overall: This seems like an important paper, PGME is huge issue in global med education and global health because of pipeline/capacity issues as well as quality of providers produced - yet most literature still focuses on the beginning of the pipeline, UGME. Med Ed in China also seems underdeveloped in the literature (most focused on SSA) - yet this large population with important public health challenges/changes in the face of rapid industrialization/globalization is very important area for study.

Major compulsory revisions: none

Minor essential revisions:

Abstract:
Results section reads more like discussion/conclusion - need some numbers/straight facts/findings here. Also, need to be careful about stating "change since 1993" when data was only collected at single point in time (2006), unless there is comparator data?

Intro:
Can the authors say anything about above the trends mentioned in "overall" comments above to give more context to readers at the beginning of the article? There is some attention to this in the discussion but I think it might help frame the article for readers if introduced here too.

Method:
15 hospitals from 12 medical schools were selected - what are the denominators (how many med schools and how many affiliated hospitals)?

What is meant by "random" selection?

Why is data from 2006 only being analyzed/presented now (7 years later) - no newer data?

Results:
Can the authors present demographics on survey respondents (e.g. gender, age, etc)?

Is the complete survey instrument available as appendix?
Last paragraph of "General overview of the state..." paragraph - could this be presented in a table (in addition to text)?

Figures - hard to remember what the 9 domains are, could these be abbreviated and embedded in the figure (e.g. instead of "1" maybe "Mission" or "1. Mission" and instead of "2" it could be "Assessment" or "2. Assessment")

Discussion:
I like the framework of "Problems" and "Strategies" but I think it could be massaged a bit to be more narrative as I'm accustomed to seeing (e.g. "We identified two important areas - problems and solutions" and then spell out in 2 paragraphs "First, we believe overall funding in Western regions is insufficient.") Maybe the pointed enumerated here could become part of a figure too capturing "Key Challenges and Recommended Strategies"?

I am a little concerned that problems/recommended strategies may go beyond the data presented here. For example, the first recommendation deals with finances but there is no survey data presented here about that - and the data presented in the discussion seems non-specific (figures are for "general education," it isn't clear how much of this is specific to medical education in the Western vs. Eastern regions). I think it could be OK for the authors to go a bit beyond their data, but it's important to be sure this discussion doesn't come off as being a comprehensive evaluation of the PGME system that engaged stakeholders at various levels, included site visits, etc. Perhaps the authors could recommend this kind of comprehensive evaluation while stating that their data begins to characterize these problems and suggests several approaches/strategies, although more data is needed to add to this initial work.

Finally, the authors need to include a paragraph addressing limitations of this study (typically, this paragraph appears just before the conclusion paragraph in the discussion).

Syntax/grammar:
Overall, this is well-written with few errors, but it would benefit from close read/editing from native English speaker. One example sentence where the point is made but the grammar is off from methods section: "In order to describe the general situations in the answering questions listed in different fields in the questionnaire, values 1, 2, 3 and 4 were assigned to grade the data according to the sequence from low to high grade, which represents dissatisfaction, partly satisfaction, satisfaction and completely satisfaction for meeting the training requirements respectively."

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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