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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the revised manuscript!
Many of the earlier comments have been met, but some are still there, together with some new ones.

Major compulsory revisions
Discussion, first sentence. In what way was there a significant impact on GPs? They were satisfied, which is concluded further down, but what kind of impact was there?

Discussion: There is still a lot of repetition of results. The authors could take out numbers and shorten the discussion by referring to the result-section. An example from the first paragraph: conclude that a majority of respondents were positive to the project. This would be a summary of the first half of the paragraph, which can then be left out.

Discussion paragraph 11: “we may have overestimated the impact of the feedback meeting...” Here one limitation with the study is highlighted. The authors seem to have designed, carried out and evaluated the project. So the evaluation may be biased by the aim of the project (which is different from the aim of this study) and the desirability to have succeeded with the project. Add to limitations.

Limitations: Parts of the limitation is about the whole project as such having limitations, not specifically the evaluation. These limitations could be presented more briefly and in one paragraph. Some however, as the bias of inclusion in the project, of course have an impact also on the evaluation.

Minor essential revisions
With the information on The Danish general practice I interpret that it is in her role as manager that the GP is approached in this study (rather than the role as doctor). Could be made clear if that is the case. Other countries may have other professions managing a GP practice, and hence being responsible for quality improvement.

Introduction, last sentence. It is nor all clear what the authors want to say with this sentence. Could be deleted?

DISCUSSION
Paragraph two: I am not sure that having learnt something necessarily involve a
reflective process.

Commentary to paragraph three: I don’t see the contradiction. The majority have learnt something, but increasing awareness is another thing. They could have had a great awareness beforehand (hence hard to increase), they learnt something else that had nothing to do with awareness, or, as the authors suggest they did not disseminate results (and possible reflections)

Paragraph seven: I don’t follow the last conclusion. How would we know that more supervised follow up activities would lead to less deterioration in job satisfaction? Do we know the reason for the deterioration in the first place?

Paragraph eight: seems out of context

Limitations: The arguments for not conducting multivariable statistic tests are rather weak (especially “limited population” as it is stated earlier that it was a high number of participating GPs).
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