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Reviewer's report:

The authors have made important revisions to the above paper and as result they have considerably strengthened it. They have fully addressed the majority of my concerns. In particular, they now give a clear impression of the development of the questionnaire and of its reliability, they have clearly described how the overall level of preparedness was calculated and their interpretation of the data is much more appropriate by emphasising that this paper reports perceptions. Furthermore, the presentation of results is much clearer as is the place of the quantitative data within the paper. They have acknowledged the alternative hypothesis that there is potential for weaknesses in the training offered by hospitals in the Netherlands as opposed to strengths arising from training in Curacao.

The authors have given further information on the power calculation. However, I am not a statistician and their techniques are unfamiliar to me and I am unable to judge their appropriateness. They have provided more text on how the Bonferroni correction was used and I assume that the appropriate multiplier was seven giving an adjusted p value on .042 (.006 x 7). Further information was given on the exclusion of inconsistent data which provides some reassurance to the reader.

I had suggested that the authors revise the stated aims of the paper on the grounds that objectives 1 and 2 (Does the training in all DTH’s prepare SpRs in the seven intended competencies and which required improvement) have not been specifically addressed in the paper or the discussion.

The first point in my review (application of today's standards to yesterday’s training) have not been specifically addressed in the revision. I acknowledge that a legitimate interpretation of these data is that the training the SpRs received up to 27 years ago was remarkably “future proof” in that it measured very well to standards first published in 2005, up to 25 years after graduation. They could perhaps make more of this in their discussion

There are still some minor typographical errors in the script and I would encourage the authors to insert the word perceived on page 13, line 17 (predictor of overall level of perceived competency.)

Overall, the authors have addressed my key scientific concerns about the paper, my remaining concerns are presentational and therefore should be regarded as
discretionary.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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