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Reviewer’s report:

Please note, I am not a statistics expert, so my review has not taken in to account the nature of the statistical analysis undertaken on the data.

The subject matter of this paper is relevant to educators with an interest in the management of training for general practice and it’s quality assurance. Whilst this may be regarded as rather a niche area, over recent years a growing number of papers have been published looking at managing training from different perspectives – standardising paperwork requirements, visiting, training environments etc.. Hombergh and colleagues have contributed to a number of these. I have some experience of research in this area, and read with interest of the work presented here. In my view the study poses some interesting questions regarding the training environment and features that may be indicative of a high quality training environment.

Major Compulsory Revisions

I would have welcomed some more information on the ethical considerations presented by the study. The authors state that the study received approval (presumably ethical approval) from Radboud University Mijmegen. I would like to have got a better sense of the consent given by the practices and doctors for the information collected for the practice accreditation program to be used for the research. Were all included and if not how many opted out?

The authors note that the RCGP is responsible for establishing the standards for training. Whilst the college may have views on this, the GMC is the standard setter: “The GMC is responsible for setting and assuring standards for specialty including GP training leading to award of a Certificate of Completion of Training.” http://www.gmc-uk.org/education/postgraduate/specialty_including_gp_training.asp

Deaneries have developed their own local approaches which reflect the standards set by the GMC, but they differ from deanery to deanery.

I would have welcomed more detail on the instrument and procedure – who in the practice completes it? How much patient feedback data is captured? How are the various sources of data combined?

As a non-statistician, I would have welcomed a description of the statistical analysis in lay terms.
The implications section is, I feel, under-developed. For instance I would be interested to hear how this research might intersect with work into the quality of educational environment?

Minor Essential Revisions
N/A

Discretionary Revisions
I would have found it helpful to see the VIP scale, perhaps as an appendix.
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