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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a well written paper examining the differences in perceptions between mentors & proteges surrounding informal mentoring.

The study title could be changed to make it simpler/clearer to understand thereby attracting readership interest more easily.

The conclusion in the abstract needs to be re-written. In its current form, the conclusion appears disjointed and somewhat unrelated to what appears in the rest of the abstract.

General comments:

- there are too many references and although appreciative of the author's attempts to scope the literature, I would suggest that the bibliography be reduced to about 1/3 and include only most current literature from better journals rather than online websites and limit the amount of self referencing.

Comments under specific headings:

- Social exchange theory - this section seems not to fit with the rest of the paper and is not developed elsewhere within the discussion nor the results applied to this theory. The authors could consider removing this section.

- Formal V's informal mentoring - this section should underpin this research and needs to be expanded to explain how such concepts as structure, measurement, objective driven, time limited, mentor expertise/training, active selection and directivity are associated with formal mentoring while unstructured, indirect, passive and intuitive are informal mentoring related.

- Perceptions of informal mentoring, age as a variable, gender as a variable and duration of the relationship sections, should be considerably condensed and made more succinct.
Methods:

- Could the authors elaborate on the ethics approval across each of the countries involved and whether participation was voluntary and how many from each country.

- Could a more detailed explanation be included as to how the participants, would be clear of the difference between formal V's informal mentorship especially given the different county cultural, language and education contexts, beyond that which has already been mentioned in the procedure section of methods. This is a fundamental premise that this research is reliant on in terms of validity i.e. are the respondents responding about the correct type of mentoring? Additional to this, was the questionnaire tested or otherwise validated in the different country contexts as some of these countries teaching may be fundamentally only formally driven.

- Under materials, how were the formal V's informal tools separated from the literature prior to inclusion into the survey tool, if this indeed matters? Of those offered the survey in each country, how many did not participate &/or did not want to be involved in the study?

Results:

A table including the distribution of participants &/or results across the various countries would be useful & any differences found found?

Discussion:

- It would be useful to include an attached copy of the full questionnaire in both languages in the appendix.

- How was the low reliability in terms of Cronbachs a addressed for the Q's within the domains of psychological support, acceptance & friendship? Were any of the deviant questions within these domains considered for removal prior to analysis?

- the limitations of this study should include the reliance on means with a rather large SD (almost 1 unit at times) which may not be ideal for non-numeric Lichert scales where intervals are unequal. Additionally the what appears to be minimalistic validation including testing of the survey instrument should be mentioned.
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