Reviewer’s report

Title: Satisfaction of doctors with their training. Evidence from UK.

Version: 0 Date: 19 May 2017

Reviewer: Victoria Brazil

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review.

IN summary this is a study with unsurprising results but a massive data set that supports the general impression of many educators.

The introduction sets up the 'why' of the study well. There are a few sentences with redundant phrases eg first sentence "there can be no doubt.."

The background provides a comprehensive literature review which covers the key issues raised in the trainee surveys and their significance in previous literature.

The methods are well explained. This is important because even if we find the overall conclusions unsurprising - this is the evidence and detail.

The descriptions of the survey questions do become a little long. Is there a link to the actual survey that might help readers who just want to look at the instrument?

The results are clearly illustrated in tables. So there are a robust reflection of the outcomes. However these may be hard for readers unused to this kind of analysis to process eg could the 'top' factors in each area be highlighted or other significant results somehow made easier for the reader to find?

Perhaps for these same readers requiring a little more narrative - is there room for some free text quotes, while recognising that you didn't do a qualitative thematic analysis of same

The discussion picks up the conversation started in the introduction well, incorporating the findings. There is some conjecture (eg in regard to BREXIT) and a few more of those either redundant or less dispassionate phrases that could be re-worded, but nil major

Thanks again for the opportunity to review
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