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General Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. This is an interesting study looking at some factors in informal mentoring and their impact. Overall, the manuscript needs a greater focus in the Introduction and a stronger rationale for the study, the methods needs further detail, and the findings need a clearer interpretation and contextualising with regards to the existing literature. There are some grammatical and typographical errors, and the manuscript would benefit from a proof read. The title of the manuscript also only focuses on one aspect of the study. The study aims to look at other factors. Therefore, it is not clear why the focus of the title is only on one aspect, especially as the findings and discussion appear to be "equal" across the factors without any greater emphasis on age.

Abstract: Conclusions currently has recommendations / future directions. Could the author add in what they have concluded based on their study findings.

Introduction: This is thorough, however, there is a great deal of information that is not pertinent to this study. There is a need to reduce and be more succinct, in the information presented on the factors and their impact in formal and informal mentoring, with a greater focus on the factors that the study is intending to evaluate. In reading the Introduction, the reader should be convinced that the existing literature, and therefore the identified gaps in the literature, all point to the need for this study and therefore the study aims. Currently, there is a lot of information about all factors and not enough and definitely not enough in-depth information pertinent to the factors being evaluated in this study. The justification for the study aims needs to be strengthened.

Methods: There are some gaps in this section. Was there a sample size calculation? How did the authors know that the final sample size was adequate for the statistical analyses? It is not clear whether a completely new survey was designed or whether items were taken from other surveys?
Was the validity and reliability of the IMRI tested and how? Why do some factors within the IMRI only have three items? What is the impact of this on the validity of the scale/factor? How were completed IMRI's selected?

Results: What was the response rate?

Overall, the results are clear, but need better interpretation, and their implications discussed in the Discussion.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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 am able to assess the statistics

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