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Reviewer's report:

Minor Revisions

Abstract – Suggest a different word than Novel. It is suggested that new or unique be used.

How was an interruption defined and operationalized in the study? This was finally reported later in the paper. It is suggested that this be reported earlier in the manuscript.

How was an interruption differentiated from distraction or multi-tasking?

What were the inclusion criteria to participate in the study?

What was the definition for experienced pediatrician

Method Section “This study is part of a larger research program is redundant to “Our study was part of a larger internal program

Not clear how only work interruptions were recorded. It is not clear with the continued discuss p

Design Section Paragraph 1 it is suggested to use a before medical

What was the medical training of the observer? Was this a doctor, a nurse, medical technologist?

What training did the observer receive? Was there any dual observing to validate the trainer’s reliability in observing and correctly coding interruptions?

Design Section Did the pediatricians complete some type of survey, questionnaire, journal? Who administered?

It would be helpful to the reader to know how the data were checked for errors and implausible values.

Analysis Section Paragraph 1 Check for verb agreement for data

Results Section Paragraph 1 typically don’t start a sentence with a number. It should be written out in words.

Limitation Section Paragraph 1 suggest replacing the convenient with convenience

Overall, suggest revisions to eliminate the use of pronouns

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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