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Author’s response to reviews:
The manuscript has been extensively revised and all of my comments have been addressed. I would only suggest to provide actual results (numbers) in the abstract instead of P values.
- Added.
Just to clarify, it is appropriate to ask authors reporting RCTs of non drug/device trials to comply with CONSORT. It is for all RCTs and encourages good reporting.

- CONSORT statement completed with prior revision. Manuscript complies with CONSORT.

1) Please state what the secondary outcomes are in the Methods section of the abstract.
   - Added.

2) Lines 331-332 - it is not clear to me what this ceiling effect is related to?

   Perhaps just state "Participating residents had high rates of reading of scientific journals and baseline mentoring"

   Or delete the sentence altogether

   - Sentence has been clarified to the following: "Participating residents had high baseline rates of reading of scientific journals and mentorship, possibly reducing the effect size of the intervention."

3) Table 2 - please add the missing percentages to the first row of the table

   - Added.