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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have proposed the interesting question of whether or not early-career/junior doctors who are not specifically conducting research understand peer review and are aware of various types of peer review and whether or not this knowledge influences clinical decision making. As the authors state in the manuscript, there does not seem to be any published research on this topic. Although the sample size of the study was relatively small (and this is acknowledged by the authors), I believe that this paper warrants publication pending revision.

Specific Comments:

1. Although the gender of individual survey recipients is not provided, the gender of the recipients are basically a 50%/50% split between men and women meaning that both sexes are well represented in the results.

2. On page 2 (in the conclusions section of the abstract), the authors refer to a lack of evidence that peer review works as a means of validation, however, on page 3 they cite a study (reference 2) which states that peer review is the best means by which research can be judged for publication. These statements seem contradictory, although later on page 3 they cite a 2007 study (reference 14) which indicates a lack of evidence that peer review achieves the perceived aim of validating research. Given the age of this study and the rapid changes in scholarly peer review processes, the authors may wish to update this reference if possible.

3. The authors should include a definition of "junior" doctors.

4. The authors should further define or clarify the following statement made on page 11 (lines 210-212) "Due to the high level of competition for London based jobs, the group......this survey was highly selected." Could the authors comment on the selection criteria?
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