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Reviewer's report:

This is a mixed methods study that examines the effectiveness and preferences for performance feedback in FHT's. The study adds to the literature on what and how to provide feedback to teams.

Strengths; The mixed methods design allows confirmation and deeper understanding of the survey results with qualitative analysis. Seven teams were involved in the study. There is mention that these were a combination of academic and community teams.

Discretionary Revision Suggestions:

1. This paper follows on work on quality indicators and it might be useful to reference this study as it may help the reader to understand what data was used for the feedback.

2. I am not an expert on qualitative methods, however, immersion/crystallization does involve the researchers in a way that a discussion about biases and how these were addressed may be useful. The involvement of FHT members is acknowledged and they were not part of the data collection. How they informed the analysis and if any personal biases entered would be important.

3. Could you clarify how many teams were considered community vs. academic teams as this may have influenced the results. The diversity of teams might be shown in a table.

4. A majority of the quotes come from the pharmacist and it is not clear if this is one person or one of the 3 interviewed. The proportion of comments from one participant questions the confirmation of this theme by other professionals.

5. It is interesting that the performance indicators were seen as biomedical. An important finding of the study is determining how performance indicators are decided. In addition a discussion on the known influences on the factors that affect the acceptability of feedback might add to the discussion.

Summary

This is an important addition to the literature on team development and quality improvement in primary care.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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