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Reviewer's report:

In this study researchers sought to understand interviewee motivation to partake in MMI selection for postgraduate family physician training. They interviewed 40 participants (using focus group?) and used framework analysis, informed by self-determination theory to examine the data. They conclude that interviewees are motivated by a sense of duty, of giving back to the profession.

My review is informed by my position as a family physician, working in an academic environment, involved with postgraduate training.

The research question is relevant, given the importance of 'candidate fit' with career selection, success within postgraduate training and the need to graduate family physicians that will contribute patients healthcare needs in the community.

However, in order to better appraise the findings, I’d suggest that the methods section needs more detail. I've outlined some suggestions below - which I hope are helpful.

1. I appreciated that the authors provided detail on the Australian context (and interested to read about this) but wondered about the practicalities of how interviewers for the MMI are recruited. Some questions I had -

   - Are interviewers remunerated (to cover locum costs; accommodation; travel)

   - Is it an expectation/requirement of working or within a RTP (e.g. I could imagine that it might be expected of a program lead to contribute - part of the job).

   - Are all family physician invited to partake in the MMI process or only those involved in postgraduate training?

I wondered how these factors might play into motivation or was this addressed in the interviews?

I also wondered about the MMI training provided (as this seemed to link to the finding of learning more about the process)
2. Could the authors provide more detail on how interviewees for this study were recruited? How was it presented to potential participants and was this a convenience sample or more purposive (for example to look for differences in motivation in relation to experience training, urban or rural physicians). Some descriptive data of the sample interviewed would be helpful - were they all physicians or were different professions involved? (and if so, how examined in the analysis)

When were interviews conducted e.g. on the day of the MMI or spread out over time? By whom - for example if being interviewed by someone working for the organizers of the MMI - might that impact on data collection?

I think it was only on second read that I realized that the study was focus group - not one-to-one interviews? How many focus groups were conducted? Might this impact on the data collected e.g. group norming??

3. I would like to know a little bit more about the questions asked.

4. I don't know very much about framework analysis and would be grateful for a few more sentences on why this was chosen and how it differs from say, thematic analysis - what did it add?

5. How did the study team account for their own reflexivity within the analysis - I was unclear if this was an independent study or conducted by people involved in the set up of the MMI, family physicians or GP trainers?

Without these details I found it hard to trust the findings. While as a family doctor the findings resonated, I also found them somewhat wholesome. Just drawing on my own experience I could imagine that some GP trainers might volunteer because of a negative experience with a trainee. This was hinted at within some of the quotes; so a possible interpretation might not be 'out of a sense of duty' but rather to prevent having to work with potentially challenging trainees?? In other words - would some interviewees have a vested interest? I wondered if the focus groups revealed any contesting motivations - it reads like all interviewees had similar motivations -but was there the possibility that within the focus group differences between different physician groups might not appear? Perhaps, if that's a possibility it could be addressed in the limitations.

Quotes would benefit from being labelled - how do we know not all from a single focus group / participant?

Hopefully these details are relatively easy to provide. This might help the authors reflect on some additional study limitations and help with issues of rigor (some sentences would be helpful in this regard)/ credibility of findings.
6. I was unclear how the survey data related to the research question and was unable to relate the demographic data reported to the interview data - was it to suggest that the participants who partook in the focus groups were representative of the entire sample?

Overall the paper is easy to follow, there are a few places where the text could be tighter and a few minor typos.

Kind regards
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