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General

- Thank you for giving me the possibility to review this interesting paper. The topic is important and the method adequate. Find some minor comments below.

Abstract:

- not sure that the term « many regions » for the novelty of the discipline of FM is correct in the abstract. I agree that they may be countries where FM is really quite new - but I hypotheze that there are more regions were FM is well known. Furthermore, if you use this affirmation in the abstract you should use it in the background section too and then it would be necessary to references or to better precise what you mean with « many » in contrary to regions or countries where FM is well known.

- Furthermore you specifies in your results and in the discussion that there are different answers for participants of these two sub-groups - but we cannot find a description of this differences in the result section - wether in the abstract nor in the result section. This needs to be better described.

Background

- First paragraphe : maybe you can consider to cite Starfield too ?

- Second paragraphe : consider to add a references to your last affirmation (« FM continues to present a wide spectrum of ground level challenges related to the variations in this scope… »)
- the purpose of your study is very interesting. However, it would be important to better explain the relation between the background and your study purpose. Furthermore, other purposes could also be explored within your background context - you choose to limite only to motivations and professional experiences. Please explain why? And precise a little more what you hope to show.

Method.

Study design:

- If I agree that a qualitative study is a good design to explore the purpose of your study, please precise why you use this method and in what the method is adequat. (and not a quantitativ method or a mixed method)

Data collection:

- I'm a little surprised that your data collection are not anonymous. Please explain. Especially because your datas are video recorded and you publish a photo collage in your paper. (maybe some persons didn't participate because of that?)

- How did you create your three questions?

- Your decision to propose the participants to choose only one question of your three should be explained here too.

Results

- Participants: do you have more information about participants: age, type of practice, students, trainees? This could help to better understand some of the interpretation

- You specify that there are different answers between regions where FM is well implanted or newer. Please specify somewhere in the result or introduction section how you separate regions in this two classes. (maybe present a table?) And precises (and discuss) these results.

- Refusals: do some congres participants refuse the participation? If yes, why?

- You present three main topics as a result of your study - please explain a little more how you found them (following the steps of your method)
Discussion

- As said before, it would be interesting to understand in what your 2 defined regions (FM well implanted or new) are different and in which way such differences (or not) could help developing FM.

- limitation : only explored FM already trained - what about other medical students ?

- translation between french, spanish and portugues may be a limitation
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