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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions:**
NONE

**Minor Essential Revisions:**
NONE

**Discretionary Revisions:**
1. The authors have chosen to focus on Core Medical Trainees and not trainees in other disciplines. Of course the study needs to be narrowed down in some way and this could be entirely appropriate, but obviously patients die in hospital in other specialities (such as surgery – which is briefly discussed relating to participants’ previous experience). Whilst this is briefly addressed in lines 87 – 90, I feel the paper would benefit from perhaps consideration of this in the ‘Limitations’ section. It may be worth considering whether the title of the paper’s reference to ‘junior doctors’ is too broad, given the study is limited to just core medical trainees.

2. Perhaps the paper would benefit from a table summarising the interview schedule/ topic guide

3. Sentence on line 37 – 39 – consider clarifying

4. ‘F1s’ is referred to in the quote on line 143 – should probably be defined somewhere

5. Lines 222 – 224 – consider clarifying

6. Lines 303 – 307 – consider adding a sentence justifying the relevance of this comment to your discussion

7. Consider reviewing where recommendations are incorporated into the paper. Eg. Lines 325 – 326 is a recommendation, whereas most other recommendations seem to be reported in the ‘Conclusions and Implications’ section.

8. I wonder whether the recommendations / implications can be expanded. The authors may feel they don’t have any further or more specific recommendations without drawing conclusions outside the scope of their data, but if they feel able to, I would be interested in a little more detail on the implications of their study for changes in practice.
9. Consider inclusion of recommendations for future research
10. Table 1 – clarify if ‘Not Known’ means participant is undecided on future career choice or they weren’t asked in the interview
11. One or two small typos, which should be eliminated on further proof reading

General Comments:
This is a well written paper with a generally clear and logical structure. Whilst I am not a qualitative research expert, it seems to hold well to the principles of qualitative research reporting I have read in other studies, with appropriate use of illustrative quotes and distinction between results and discussion.
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