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Reviewer's report:

Well written manuscript about an important topic. The revision has improved the manuscript. I have a few minor comments/concerns:

Abstract:

The conclusion is not supported by the study. SIGs can provide early surgical exposure, but there is no evidence that they help students excel in surgery. Perhaps state that they may provide a foundation that can contribute to student success in surgery. Or leave that statement out altogether.

Methods:

It would be helpful to define who is a SIG executive early on in the paper. It is unclear in the methods if they are fellow medical students or surgical faculty.

The informed consent sentence is vague. "Informed consent was considered obtained if respondents completed the entirety of the survey, which was detailed at the beginning of the survey."

Were the participants informed that this is a research study and that participation was voluntary?

Discussion:

It is difficult to comment on percentage of women interested in surgery as response rate cannot be calculated. It is possible that women are the minority of students in the SIGs, but were more likely to respond to the survey.
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.

No

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 am able to assess the statistics

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