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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

This mostly qualitative study looks to define motivations for interviewers to participate in the MMI program to select post-graduate trainees. The authors have addressed my earlier comments & writing is generally tighter with better flow. I have also identified some minor revisions for the current version.

Additional revisions

p2 Ln38-43 Awkward sentence phrasing. Suggest: A ##% increase in candidate numbers and % increase in needed interviewers has occurred in the past 3 test administrations

p2 Ln 54 Move to methods rather than results and replace the sentence in methods starting with "a convenience sample of NAC sites..."

p4 Ln 91-94 Applicants spend a brief period of time with one interviewer [on a focused quested] and then move to the next interview room [for another distinct interaction]. Recommended change for clarity

p5 Ln 113-114 ...SDT, developed by Deci & Ryan was applied (rather than makes intuitive sense)

p5 Ln 123-4 Recommend adding additional content such as ... "with ## interviews needed over ## days per session."

p6 Ln 155 add A convenience sample of NAC sites was used [to recruit interviewers for focus groups]

p7 Ln 182 Add "only" before 1%
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 recommend additional statistical review

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