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Dear Claire Tree-Booker, Editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript entitled “The Effects of Residency Training on Patient Outcomes: a Systematic Review” for publication in BMC Medicine. We are grateful to The Journal and the reviewers for the insightful remarks. We herein share our point-by-point revisions in response to the editorial changes and the reviewer’s report.

Editorial concerns

1. Please provide full legends for your figures; Figures should have a short title of figure (maximum 15 words) and also detailed legend (up to 300 words).

We thank the editor for the suggestion to provide a short title and legends to our figures. The title of figure one now states: “Disposition of the articles found on the link between residency training and patient outcomes.” There were no abbreviations in our figures to include in a figure legend.

2. Please indicate that this is a meta-analysis in the title of your manuscript. Therefore, the revised title should read ‘A Systematic Review and meta-analysis of the Effects of Residency Training on Patient Outcomes’

We thank the editor for the suggestion. If suitable, we would indeed have performed a meta-analysis as stated in the data synthesis and analysis section, which now states: “If data were suitable, we performed a meta-analysis, to synthesize and pool research findings using effect measures of studies with related research hypotheses. If the results were too heterogeneous, we described all study outcomes using narrative analysis and a construction of subgroups based on primary objectives of studies in order to clarify study results and draw conclusions.” Since the included articles were not suitable for a meta-analysis, we refrained from performing a meta-analysis and therefore chose to keep the title as is was.

Reviewer’s report

Minor Essential Revisions

Suggest reorder the boxes in figure 1 to match the order in the text (19, 7, 10, 43 studies included respectively).

We thank the reviewer for the careful reading and suggestion for improvement. We have reordered the boxes in figure 1 to match the order in the text.

We are looking forward to your thoughtful consideration and hopefully favorable decision to publish the revised and formatted manuscript.

Yours sincerely,
Renée van der Leeuw, MD
On behalf of all authors