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Reviewer’s report:

The article addresses a theme of interest as feedback has been pointed as an important facet of effective continuing educational interventions and has not been so much investigated. The study brings a relatively new contribution by focusing on interdisciplinary teams whereas most studies on the field focus on a single professional, such as physicians and nurses. In my view, there are a few major and minor revisions to be made to improve the article.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. It seems to me that the Background and the Discussion sections should be considerably extended by including the literature on professionals’ behavior changes and on effectiveness of interventions aimed at improving professional practices. A theoretical framework is required to study whether and why feedback was accepted and/or affected the professionals’ performance (an attempt should be made, for example, to explain the findings that no action was taken to improve performance in light of what is known about what moves professionals to changes).

2. In my view, the authors made Conclusions that went beyond the inferences supported by the results of the study. While the findings suggest a controversy about the value of team vs individual professionals feedback, the first sentence of the Conclusions section makes a conclusive statement in another direction, which seems to express more the authors’ point of view than the results of the study. The same trend to favor the team-level performance feedback against the individual level is made in the second paragraph of the Discussion, for example, in which the text refers to a “strong preference” for the former, whereas the study did not include measurements of preference and the findings in fact seem to indicate different views among the professionals. The discussion and conclusions should avoid making inferences that cannot be made while using the study methods. A more tentative tone would also be more appropriate when addressing issues that seemed clearly controversial.

Minor Essential Revisions

3. The question posed by the authors could be probably made more precise by mentioning the focus of their evaluation with regards to the impact of the feedback. It seems that the study focused on impact on certain aspects, such as team building and performance about certain problems, and this scope should be made explicit.
4. The Title could provide more information about the objective of the study by mentioning the focus on acceptability and impact of the performance feedback. The Abstract is in general appropriate but could be improved by adjusting the Conclusions (see comments on the Conclusions section above).

5. The Methods section would benefit from a review that would present the information in the usual structured format adopted to describe the methods (e.g., overview of the design, participants, materials, procedure, data analysis).

6. More details about the Methods would help the reader to understand and assess the quality of the study. It would be helpful to present, for example, the performance indicators that were selected to offer feedback, how they were selected and by whom, more details about the questions of the survey and the interview. This information could be usually added as an appendix to the text. It is not very clear how the data analysis for the survey and the interview was conducted. Minimal explanation about approaches such as “immersion/crystallization” which were used during data analysis should be included, because the readers do not necessarily know about them.

7. It is not entirely clear where the findings presented in the last heading of the Results section have come from. It might be from the interviews, but the readers have not enough information on the questions of the interviews and data on their results is not presented.

8. References are required in many points of the text that refer to previous research without citing the sources (e.g., in the first and the last paragraphs of the Discussion section).

Discretionary Revisions

9. I would say that further exploring the discrepant responses about the value of individual level feedback vs team-level feedback in light of the theories of professionals change could substantially enrich the paper.

10. In some points in the Discussion the authors advocate the need to develop performance indicators that nurses and other professionals could seen as expressing their work. I assume this statement applies to indicators that would be used to evaluate the team performance and to provide feedback. Perhaps this discussion should be phrased in a better way to avoid misunderstanding. Readers may think that priorities were inverted here. Evaluation of performance should indeed be based on indicators that better capture outcomes in terms of patients’ health, i.e., the focus should not be on the providers’ needs to have their contribution to their practice recognized but on the patients’ needs to have health care provided to them evaluated accurately.
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