RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Reviewer A- Thank you so much for your constructive feedback. I modified the sentence you mentioned (line 109) and made other changes throughout the manuscript to make the interview an easier read. Please see the marked manuscript for those changes.

Reviewer B- Thank you so much for your constructive feedback. I added an extra line to give more details on the nature of the simulation studies. Please see the marked manuscript for that change as well as other changes I made to make the interview an easier read. I added a response to some of the major comments below. Almost all of the small changes you suggested I implemented.

1. The university uses both anesthesiology and anesthesia, so I made that change.
2. I decided not to add anything about the simulated environment. I tried initially to add a line, but it just felt like I was getting side tracked.

Reviewer C- Thank you so much for your constructive feedback. I have modified a number of sentences and reorganized paragraphs to fix some of the formatting and clarity issues. I decided not to add anything on how medical trainees could support one another to combat hierarchy in medicine. I originally attempted to add an extra sentence to address this point. However, after consulting the interviewee, we both felt that to give this point justice, it would have to be an additional question. I do not wish to lengthen the interview considering that it is already sufficient in terms of length. Please see the marked manuscript for the other changes made and my responses below.

Abstract avoid the repetition of “Dr. Dylan Bould” at the start of sentences. Please use other words like, he or rearrange the sentence.

I made those changes. Thank you.

Line 14-17 and any question: avoid the uppercase, gives the impression you were yelling. I would suggest italicizing.

I simply followed the format used in past interviews published in UOJM.

Lines 19-27 great foundation for the remainder of the interview, gives the reader the necessary background.

Thank you.

Lines 72-73 great question thank you for posing this and wonderful explanation provided.

Thank you.

Lines 87-90 Good follow up question

Thank you.

Line 119 good question however perhaps there is a way to better transition to this question from the topic of hierarchy based on previous questions. If possible list the research about hierarchy first and then the research at the Ottawa Skills and Simulation Centre.

I tried many times to rearrange the question, but I felt in the end that this was the best place to put the question.

Lines 151 to 153, rephrase the question to “I would like to go back to your comment on mentorship as I believe you were doing some work in this area. “

I appreciate this comment. I made some minor adjustments to that question to give it a better flow.

Line 160 I understand that Viren Naik is a name, but do not understand if the “in” is part of the name.

No, “in” is not part of the name. I took it out to make it flow better.