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Reviewer's report:

General
1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
Yes. The situation they describe is not new, but their articulation is welcome and well achieved.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
This is a sociologically inspired reflection on the structures that lead to the promotion of interdisciplinary (healthcare) research and on the experience of those involved as postgraduate students. There is no formal methods section.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
There are no data as such. The arguments are well supported by literature, clearly expressed and logical.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
See above. This isn’t really relevant.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes the arguments are well-balanced, well made and supported by literature.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

7. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes. It is articulate and accessible.

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

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
NONE

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

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
NONE

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Possible discretionary revisions: the authors might want to work this up into a more in-depth paper that examines research and education policy in Australia and as such would be more of a policy analysis paper. The paper (particularly if revised as I suggested), could well be place in your Health Research, Policy and Systems journal or a medical ethics journal. However, as it stands, and if acceptable, it could have a place in one of your general journals.

Which journal?: Appropriate or potentially appropriate for BMC Medicine: an article of outstanding merit
and interest in its field

**What next?**: Accept for publication in BMC Medicine after discretionary revisions

**Quality of written English**: Acceptable

**Statistical review**: No

**Declaration of competing interests**: I declare that I have no competing interests.