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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. Here are my suggestions for its improvement:

1) Please report n and % in the abstract

2) Line 39 u have two dots at the end: based..

3) Your question - How often do you look up information in scientific journals to aid your clinical decision making? - did not have a no answers - so in regards to the different answers respondents gave to this question - were there differences between respondents in the other answers they gave? Please also address in the discussion that you did not assess the main source of information these junior doctors go to for clinical decision making.

4) Similarly to above - have you compared differences between the answers given on the sociodemographic data and the rest of the questions?

You do say that - There is no comparative analysis because the subgroups were too small to obtain meaningful results, however gender wise, having ever done a peer review or never, as well having a postgraduate degree or not having one are some of the categories you could check differences for - as there is enough participants for that. also regarding those that have and those that have never published a paper.

5) When you do treat the sample as a whole - some statistics (chi squared tests) would be welcome - as on a sample of this size there is really no stat. difference between trustworthiness to NEJM137/178 (77%), and Lancet 129/178(72%). Also, it would be good instead of listing percentages to say what stat. differences you did find, e.d. in hearing about different types of peer review aside the decoupled and the post publication types.

6) In the discussion you say - Doctors may feel they do not often need to directly refer to primary research in their day to day work. - please mention here the percentages of your study

7) Your finding that junior doctors find questionable the peer review process in the key journal in their field is very interesting - I would welcome your views on this.
8) Additionally, while you have explored do they trust single blind more or less than the other types - the reasons behind this were not addressed in this study, but should be perhaps mentioned as limitation or in the discussion.

9) Finally, although you acknowledge the non-representativeness of your sample, could you list the number of junior doctors in the UK - and describe perhaps in the UK system how much decision making they have during their training/practice.

10) Conclusion - you say: explore the views of a group of hospital doctors - please put here also junior doctors.

11) I would also suggest rewriting your final conclusion - it seems very normal (to me) that junior doctors do not wish to scrutinize already published papers - the purpose of the publication process and the peer review is to do so, therefore similar to other service, young doctors can have expectations that it is done properly and only with to use it as a finished product (even if such expectations are naive in regards to the current system).

Kind regards,

Mario Malicki
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