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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is a large study with a good response rate. The weakness is that it is a study done in just one institution. It would help the reader to know a little more about this organisation, its setting, workload and its reputation.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The authors have commented in their discussion that the differences discovered between residents and faculty could be partly due to personal circumstances and demographics. They speak of the generation gap. They have collected the demographics of age, gender and race but have not used these in their analysis. This makes interpretation of the results difficult. It is likely for example that the resident group contained a higher proportion of women than the faculty group. Since women doctors have been shown to experience more stress, depression and anxiety, this is relevant in interpreting the findings. Equally, the authors recognise the likely older age of faculty as a factor in career satisfaction, but do not present any analysis by age. Are young faculty different from old in this regard? Does race matter, and if so, does it have more of an impact on residents or faculty? The authors would greatly enhance the value of this paper, and the strength of their conclusions, if they presented an analysis taking these demographic factors into account.

The authors state that the demographics of the faculty in the study reflected those across the USA, and the residents reflected the demographics of medical students across the USA. The references for making these two statements should be provided. Did the unit not have an influx of international medical graduates among the residents group, and did this not affect the demographics, compared with medical students?

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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