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Reviewer’s report:

Thank the Editor for this opportunity to review the manuscript—Medical student experiences in prison health services and Social Cognitive Career Choice: a qualitative study. Here are some suggestions which may make this manuscript better:

1. In Setting in Methods, Line number 148 had "metropolitan prisons catering for male prisoners", which does not make sense to the readers. Please check if this is correct.

2. At the end of Data collection, the authors presented "Interviews duration ranged ….. an average of 27 minutes", which should belong to "Results", not Methods. It is never known until the study was completed.

3. If I correctly understand this study, there were two parts in this study: (1) a pre and post questionnaire included free text responses; and (2) a face-to-face or telephone semi-structured. However, throughout the manuscript, neither the methods nor the results of pre and post questionnaires were reported in this study. Please present the methods and results of pre and post questionnaires, or let the eager readers know why the questionnaire results are absent.

4. In Participant characteristics, only limited information is provided. It would be highly suggested that the authors provide age and gender of each participant, as well as each student's prior experience with underserved population or prisoners. It is important to provide each student's prior experience with underserved population or prisoners for distinguishing whether the students' positive attitudes are attributable to the course in prison he/she has done.

5. It is highly suggested that a quotation mark should be placed right before and right after the verbal data.

6. I would suggest the authors to point out the sampling method used in this study using academic terms commonly used in qualitative studies, e.g. criteria sampling, snowball sampling, purposeful sampling, and so on.

7. The authors should propose justifications for why the themes proposed in this study were theoretically saturated.
8. Typos and inconsistent usage of a term throughout the manuscript should be carefully checked. For example, Line 264 "gaol", Line 256 "quite [open and conversational]", and healthcare/health care ……

9. In "The work of doctors in prison", the authors reported two verbal data (Student 3 and Student 19) to support that the work of doctors in prisons is so different from what they expected. However, the verbal data of "Student 19": "Doctor X has probably worked a lot of on his own …… a lot of decisions have to be made ………" As a reader, I just cannot agree with the difference based on "Student 19"’s verbal data. As a physician, almost everyone "works a lot of on his own …… a lot of decisions have to be made ………" I would suggest the authors to provide more convincing data to support this sub-theme.

10. In Limitations, the authors pointed out "there was no qualitative difference between the views ……… for the placement." However, the authors did not present any data/results in support of this description. I would highly suggest the authors to report qualitative data/quantitative data to support this important description.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

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