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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Overall comments:

Strategic elements of residency training in China: transactional leadership, self-efficacy and the employee-orientation culture

An interesting study and a different way to consider residency training and how to improve outcomes in relation to performance

A useful amount of literature of 43 references- perhaps this could make a greater contribution to the text

I suspect that this is an important paper in relation to residency training in China but it requires better structuring with feedback as follows

A comparison with other countries may help in the background

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Specific recommendations:

It would be useful in the Background section at the start to define transactional leadership style (TLS). This the appears in the method section, but should appear earlier. The same applies to the concept of self-efficacy. Similarly, for Employee-oriented organizational culture (EOC). The method should contain what the research process was.

"The teachers' different leadership styles have different effects on the ignorable performance of residents [8]." Could this sentence be re-written to make it clearer and so in relation to TLS what the main objective of the paper is?

A background to what the residency training system is in China would help the reader and in particular to General Practice and so why the lack of GPs

In relation to the sample how does it "respectively represent the developed and average medical levels of China." Why were 49 of the questionnaires out of 400 invalid?
Were the questionnaires comprised of the 4 elements to measure TLS, self-efficacy, EOC and the performance of residents? How long was the questionnaire?

**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.

No

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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