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Reviewer's report:

The idea and methods presented here are interesting and I found myself wanting to read the results. The results as presented however are simply too long and require better organization. I understand the need for increased word count due to the qualitative nature of the study, but many of the quotes presented felt redundant, and the message seemed to alternate between support and non-support continuously, which detracted from the argument. My suggestion would be to be very judicious about which quotes are presented, using only those that advance the argument (probably eliminating about half the quotes). Secondly, I would structure the results in a systematic fashion—Verbal (supportive then non-supportive), non-verbal (supportive then non-supportive), organizational culture (supportive then non-supportive) rather than attempting to show support and non-support for each subgroup concept. I would also encourage the authors to add more depth to their study (which they could probably do by reviewing their quotes); right now the message is 'when attendings are supportive, following the requirements is easier; when they aren't, it is harder". This leaves the reader somewhat dissatisfied as larger questions—such as how do the resident and attending groups view the restrictions and how does the implicit bias affect behavior—are largely left unexplored. My suggestion would be to revisit the transcripts and look for more depth in order to present more meaningful findings from what appears to be a very good study.

Also: multiple typos throughout article, mainly due to the overuse of apostrophes when using the plural attendings and residents; 1st sentence of introduction should be referenced; tables should be able to stand alone...in order to do this they need n values, and if categories do not match total 'n' there should be an explanation for why (in footnote ok); also percentages in tables would be nice. Also typo 1st line of page 6.

My suggestion would be to include participant numbers to identify quotes.

It would also be helpful to include a sentence about whether the programs have ever had duty-hour violations, in order to put all of the findings in context.
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