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Reviewer's report:

General

I have some comments and questions about the statistical analyses used in the manuscript that examines cultural climate of training environment on physicians' self-perception of competence and preparedness.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Power analysis. I am not clear on what makes G*Power unique. On p 8, what outcome was used to estimate the sample size of 40 subjects?

2. Statistical analyses. Why were parametric procedures (t test, analysis of variance, regression) used on ordinal data? Were assumptions for proper use of these procedures satisfied? Nonparametric procedures are appropriate in this situation. Descriptive statistics can be reported as medians and interquartile ranges, although with a 4-point Likert scale, it is difficult to see how an estimate of variability will be useful.

3. Statistical analyses. How were the statistical analyses performed? I was unable to find a reference to the software used.

4. Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons, p 10. Why was the Bonferroni procedure used to control for multiple comparisons? Although it is effective at controlling the overall error rate, its power is quite low.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Abstract, Results, lines 15-16. Based on the estimates you report, how can you say that overall perception of preparedness in the Caribbean group was even slightly higher than the European group?

2. Questionnaires, p 8, line 15. On what basis were the 4 incorrectly filled-out questionnaires excluded?

3. Percentages, Results and Tables. Is 0.1% all that meaningful? Please report percentages to the nearest integer. The values will be easier to read as integers, and you want your manuscript to be as easy to read as possible.

4. Results, influence of training on level of preparedness, p 11, lines 12-14. If
you want to make a point of potential differences based on year of graduation, age, and training setting, why did you not do a post-hoc power analysis as you did for the primary outcome?

Discretionary Revisions

None
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