Reviewer’s report

Title: Choosing a career in oncology: Results of a nationwide cross-sectional study

Version: 1 Date: 28 May 2017

Reviewer: Melissa Lee

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your revisions to the manuscript which address most of the previous reviewer comments. Of note, the addition of Figure 1 greatly enhances the understanding of the Oncology training pathway in France, and there is also much greater critical analysis of the results in the discussion with reference to previous literature compared to previous versions of the manuscript.

My main areas of criticism are on the meaning of the following phrases, which are essential to the conclusion of the study:

Lines 106, 243, 347, 617, 794: The meaning of "humanism - richness human relations" is unclear. Please expand/re-word/elaborate.

Line 243: The meaning of "transversal aspect" is unclear. Do you mean the wide range of knowledge/skills/subspecialities/practice? Please expand/re-word/elaborate.

Lines 320, 347, 457-458: Again, the meaning of "transversal aspect" and "richness of human relations" is unclear. Please clarify.

There are some minor suggestions below:

Line 128: There is an extra space at the end of "3 years" and the comma.

Line 129: "Enroll" is spelt incorrectly.
Line 129-130: The sentence should be reworded to read "…and choose a specialty and a medical school… to complete their internship according to their ranking position". Medical school also does not need to be capitalised.


Line 154: Medical School does not need to be capitalised.

Line 155: "aren't" should be lengthened to "are not" in line with conventional academic writing.

Line 178 and 179: Please expand the abbreviations DES and DESC in their first appearance in the manuscript.

Line 278: There is an extra space at the end of "full-time" and before the comma.

Line 289: There is an extra space in "Ph D". Please remove.

Line 321: "Most residents would like to make a rotation…". Perhaps this would be better written as "Most residents would like to undertake a rotation…"

Line 339: Please remove "An". Reword this same sentence as not all young oncologists participated in this study. Consider rewording to "Another strength of this study is that a wide range of young oncologists…"
Line 349: The sentence "There is no difference for the ECN training..." does not read well. Please re-word. Also, what does "ECN" stand for? This was not previously spelt out in the text above (only in the Table/Figure footnotes). It is not spelt out till line 361-362.

Line 353: "physician patient" requires a hyphen between the two words.

Line 374: "... accommodate residents' training projects, more resources" - there should be an "and" rather than a comma between "projects" and "more"

Line 375: "dedicated" is spelt twice here. Please correct.

Line 372, 376, 377: "Medical School" does not require capitalisation.

Line 378: "wasn't" should be lengthened to "was not" in line with conventional academic writing.

Line 378-381: These two sentences could be better written to make it easier for the reader to understand the meaning. Please consider re-wording.

I thank the authors for their time and efforts in amending their manuscript.
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