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Reviewer's report:

General
This is a well written paper reporting results of a well executed qualitative study. The area of inquiry - experiences and perceptions of PRHOs - is an important one and the findings add to a growing pool of understanding. The findings in themselves are not particularly remarkable, and interestingly would probably concur with the experience of people who did their house jobs a long time ago (including myself! - over 30 years). I also feel the title of the paper is a little misleading, since although issues to do with teamwork are significant, the overarching theme is the broader context of the working environment in which the PRHOs work.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
I would like the authors to at least consider my contention that the main theme of their findings is to with a broader context than 'teamworking', whilst accepting that is an important area element of the broader context.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
- page 3, para 2 - need to clarify that you mean 'by the time of qualification' refers to qualifying from medical school, NOT the PRHO year (for international readership)
- page 6, para 1 - '...senior staff WERE less accessible.'
- I think the paper would benefit from an overview box of all the sub-categories within the three main categories (e.g. 'Supportive environment' subsumes 'Constructive feedback from senior colleagues', 'Sharing responsibilities and tasks' etc etc)
- in Discussion, I think the sentence about how areas of conflict being addressed by more interprofessional training needs to be expanded - the authors rightly say 'MIGHT' because the evidence for efficacy of IPE is not yet established - and this should be acknowledged.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No
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