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Reviewer’s report:

This paper explains the perception of clinical teachers on high-quality teaching, barriers and facilitators & training and evaluation utility. They have made a comparisons between junior physicians and assistant professors' perceptions. The study is of importance and the findings could be useful to highlight the significance of junior doctors training in teaching. There are certain concerns that need to be addressed:

* The research question/aim in the abstract is not clear or specific. The themes investigated should be clarified and the need to compare junior doctors and assistant professors on these themes.

* The authors have be cautious about their statements without adequate reference or authors assumption should be clarified

"Not all of them may have chosen this work environment because they wanted to become clinical teachers, and in most medical schools the completion of a didactic training programme is not a prerequisite for being allowed to teach medical students."

* How was the qualitative data analysed? Was any psychometric testing considered for the developed tool?

* Local Institutional Review Board - the organisation name could be mentioned.

* The authors have to be cautious of their interpretation and make sure if their interpretation is derived only from their data or supporting literature. For example the following statement is long drawn from the results

"Teaching should be supported and valued as equally important as patient care and research. This means there can be no trade-off between either of these goals, but all of them should count towards performance measures of individual clinical teachers"

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.

Yes

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

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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