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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript overall is organized very well, with a clear research aim, background introduction, research design, research results, discussion and conclusion. There are some suggestions for further improvement. Firstly, the title is too long, the reviewer suggests the authors to improve the title that can be exactly expressed the ideas of this manuscript. The context of Denmark should be pointed out, and the reviewer does not think A Qualitative study is a necessity. The title aims to describe the core points of the article, but use the least words instead of a sentence. Secondly, the abstract requires the restructure. The reviewers suggests the following logic: background, research aims, theories, methods, results, and conclusions. Thirdly, In the Background, the reviewer is confused whether the part Why is the effect of supervision courses doubtful is the sub part of the Background, and under this, there are two small sections, The supervisor needs and disciplinary differences. The reviewer suggests firstly to improve the background that strongly underpins in the context of Denmark, why this study is necessary in meeting knowledge gaps, and secondly to develop a theoretical framework in relation to the research aims or research questions in order to support research design and explore the discussions of the results. In the part of Method, theories of data analysis is necessary to be improved, although there is a section on page 8. The authors mentioned Richie and Spencer, but a detailed point relating to data analysis methods is required. In the part of Results, interview data requires to be a better management. The quotes of interview data require to be cited the mark of interviewee, this also should be done more in the research design. For example, in section of Participants, a table is necessary to mark all the interviewees, and meanwhile in the later quoting the data, the mark of interviewee should be used. In the part of Conclusion, besides what we have learned from this study, if the context emphasizes the context in Denmark, then what would be the implications for medical phd education in other contexts, for example, in nordic countries?
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