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Reviewer's report:

The author has presented the results of anonymous questionnaires completed by medical students from 4 medical schools in Philadelphia, USA and 1 medical school in Warsaw, Poland. The paper is written as a quantitative analysis, and is interested in comparing students who have a physician in the family vs those that do not.

The major concern with the statistical methods is the insufficient detail provided on the study design, sampling frame and sampling methods. Without detail on study design, methods and response rate, it is very difficult to assess the generalisation and validity of the results presented. It may be that the methods are sufficient, but at a minimum a number of additional aspects of the study need to be reported before this can be assessed. There are also a number of minor issues, and areas that need clarification.

Major:

- What was the study design? Was the questionnaire given to every student enrolled in each of the classes during the study period? Was it mandatory?

- What was the response rate? Please break it down by year of study and country/university.

- Please include all other relevant details of study design and sampling strategy.

- Please detail the breakdown of the questions. The methods state there were 8 + 4 questions; but later says that two of the main questions were composed of 20 statements and then that a factor analysis was done (only?) on these two questions, which then leads to 5 indexes. I am not clear on a) what kind of factor analysis and b) what questions or statements went into that procedure. How were statements processed prior to the factor analysis? Only the results of three indexes are reported (table 1: reciprocity; table 2: doctors rights; table 3: trust) - where/what are the other two indexes?

- Near the end of the methods (line 34) post-stratification weights were applied. Please detail the elements that went into the calculation of these weights.
- The statistical methods need to be presented in greater detail.

Minor:

Lines 43-54 belong in the Methods.

Exact p-values and reporting of p-values for all significant and not significant results is preferred.

**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.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**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:

Acceptable
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