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Reviewer's report:

Overall, this is a well done exploratory study that contributes unique data to the scholarly work around duty hour restrictions. It should be accepted for publication with a few minor revisions. I commend the authors for seeking to represent the residents' voice in this area of research. Further expansion on this concept will be important as the medical education world seeks to embrace the qualities of the Quadruple Aim (including physician wellness). Additionally, this type of work is important as it sheds light on the impact of the "hidden curriculum" and the importance of transparency.

I identified a few areas in which I think further clarification or attention could help the readers understand the results of this study more fully. The first includes a more thorough description of the participants and the recruitment process. I found myself wanting to know more about who your participants were, how they were recruited, how many were solicited and how many actually participated. You stated that "Participants were recruited via an email to program coordinators who helped set up times to meet and distributed informational emails to residents." Did the program coordinator pick the residents to be involved? Or did they just send an email on to residents who then voluntarily signed up? This is important to put in perspective and offer to the reader as one could start to wonder if only disgruntled residents participated, or a not representative sample per program. Perhaps there is bias here that needs to be considered in the results and discussion.

Also Line 56 on page 6 of the PDF- you mention residents were from both surgical and non-surgical specialties. Was there a reason that you specifically listed the non-surgical specialties (FM, IM, peds) but not the types of surgical specialties? I wanted to know if this was just general surgery or if OB/GYN, ENT, Plastics etc were included here. This line states participants included..., which implies those that responded to the survey were these types of specialties. Did you recruit to specialties other than those of the people that participated? And finally, what was the breakdown of surgical/non-surgical participants with respect to the academic and community programs. Though I know you did not have the power to look at differences it feels important to know if surgical specialties were represented at both types of programs.
The other question that kept lingering in my mind which could use some attention in the discussion section is the idea that your questions asked a general question about "attendings". I am concerned that if a resident had a negative experience with one attending this could be translated into how all "attendings" act. This might especially be true for interns or residents that did not have as much exposure to multiple attendings (perhaps at the community programs).

Thank you for your contribution to this scholarly area. I look forward to reading this study and hopefully others that you produce on this topic
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