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Reviewer's report:

This study describes the use of a study to assess the current status of CPEP in Korea. The manuscript is well-organized and clear, with adequate justification for the study. The following review is offered in an attempt to help strengthen the manuscript:

METHODS:

Given your sample size, you may also want to consider running a factor analysis to confirm the factors you use (i.e. stress, change in competency, evaluation satisfaction). Although not necessary, it could add supporting evidence for the factor structure you are using, when considered alongside the reliability statistics you have reported.

RESULTS:

1. The response rate is missing and needs to be included. I would include a response rate for the number of students that participated (i.e. 1,138 students out of how many total enrolled that year?) and the number of students that met the inclusion criteria (i.e. 646 out of how many total students enrolled that year?)

2. As you note in the limitations, the response rate/sampling is the biggest limitation in this study. While higher than other similar studies, this still limits your ability to make claims about the entire population of students in Korea. To help strengthen your ability to make claims, consider adding a column to Table 1 that describes the variables for all students enrolled that year. In other words, is the age distribution for the students in your sample similar to the age distribution of all students that year? Same for gender, practice site, etc....if you can show that the sample is approximately similar to the population of students, it will strengthen your ability to argue that these findings are likely to be similar across all students.

3. Be care about overstated claims from surveys that measure student perceptions. On page 8, line 182, the CPEPM outcomes do not represent the capability of students - rather, it represents student self-perceptions or student beliefs about capability changes...

4. There is a lot of information missing about the multivariate regression that needs to be included. For example, how was CPEPM outcome measured? Is it the sum of student responses?
Same for the factors = are they sums for those items? Also, did you ensure that the model did not violate assumptions of multivariate regression (e.g. normality, multicollinearity, etc). I suspect that you may have some items in your model that are correlated....

5. It's not clear what the footnote "b" means in Table 4 = were these variables controlled for in the model? were they dropped because they were not significant? what do they represent?

6. As it relates to the regression model, more information is needed. Without it, the model cannot be interpreted by the reader and the methods cannot be reproduced by others. Either build this out more, or consider removing the regression model all together.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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