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Reviewer’s report:

This is interesting research dealing with the motivations and experiences of General Practitioner supervisors. In the present manuscript, the authors conclude that Supervisors report positively on their teaching and mentoring roles. Recruitment strategies that highlight the personal and professional benefits that supervision offers are needed. However, a few critics need to be addressed for this conclusion.

1. The authors categorized the age of interviewee as "less than 40 years, 40-60 years and over 60 years. What's the reason for that categorization? And were there any differences in the results of the interview regarding ages?

2. How long is the GP training period that the registrars should practice under supervision? Do GP supervisors evaluate their trainees after training program? I think appropriate evaluation of trainee is required.

3. How long were the participants' experiences as GP supervisor? The periods of GP supervisor experience might influence the results.

4. Do you have any accreditation for education for GP training program in Australia? Are there accreditation standards for the training program?

5. In the conclusion, authors described that "Our study suggests many, but not all, supervisors are adopting an adult learning approach". I couldn't find any objective evidence for that conclusion.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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