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Reviewer's report:

While I think the analysis of a large data set that is reported in this paper is reasonable and potentially useful, the manuscript requires considerable revision. First of all there are many typos and overly long and unclear sentences. Generally it needs more careful editing. An example of an overly long and unclear sentence is on page 5. It begins "This study considers vast numbers of trainees. . . . Another is on page 15, the sentence on line 9-16. What is meant by "links to all staff surveys" is not clear. And the sentence is making a number of recommendations but the meaning is unclear without further elaboration.

The authors have used the term "categorical" variable incorrectly. On page 7 a variable that ranges from 0-100 is described as categorical; I think they mean "interval".

Did the analysis conducted compare four years of data with two years of data? In the results section there is reference to findings from the last two years of data and also from the four years of data. Yet, the Method section did not report that analyses were done with just the last two years of data. As the Method section is written, it appears that the analysis was of the data from four years of survey results.

There is some confusion about the meaning of the word "hypothesis". We are never told what the hypotheses were - just what the research question was.

I think an estimate of the number of unique trainees that the data represents would be useful. That is, approximately how many trainees would have been responsible for the 173,652 responses to the survey over the 4 years?

The Discussion should be tightened up. On page 12, specifically the paragraph between lines 32- 47 reports findings from other studies, and an argument for the importance of the study. This should be included in the Background section. Also in the Discussion, the authors recognize in the last paragraph that the points they are making are outside the scope of the current study - so I suggest they not be included.

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.

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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