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Title: Effects of coaching supervision, mentoring supervision and abusive supervision on talent development among trainee doctors in public hospitals: moderating role of clinical learning environment

In this manuscript the authors have attempted to study the effects of different supervision styles on talent development of trainee doctors when the clinical learning environment moderates the relationship between supervision styles and talent development. The manuscript is easy to read but requires editing. I believe the message relayed by this manuscript is useful but requires some major changes to be done. I list below the changes:

Major Compulsory revisions:
(1) The introduction section should address the following questions:
   a. ‘what we know’
   b. ‘what we need to know’
   c. Why is it important to know this
   d. how your paper will close the gap

   It will be better if the authors ensure these questions are addressed in sequence. Specifically, the authors need to explain why the moderating role of clinical environment need to be considered. Why did the authors choose these three supervisory styles?

(2) There is no explanation on the theoretical framework and the theories used to construct the framework. The authors use three different theories in hypotheses development to address three different styles of supervision. But it is not clear as to how these theories are linked to supervisory styles.

(3) Since the role of clinical learning environment is tested for moderating role, the authors need to explain this environment. What do authors mean by a favorable/unfavorable environment? What constitutes a favorable/unfavorable environment?

(4) Was any pilot test conducted? There is no mention.
(5) Since the model is a simple model, why not use hierarchical regression? Why use SEM?

(6) Why not test the talent development with each of its dimensions rather than parceling them? Testing against each dimension may give better results.

Minor essential revision

(7) Actual p-values must be given.

(8) Table 2 – give squared correlations above the diagonal and also indicate AVE in Table 2.

(9) Thorough editing of the manuscript

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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