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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

Abstract – Results Paragraph
Would recommend discussion on trends rather than review of numbers – this paragraph can be a little confusing to clearly glean what was the better cost model.

Abstract – Conclusions Paragraph
Recommend a statement on why that teaching model results in a greater financial benefit.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Abstract – Background Paragraph
Second sentence – recommend rewording (concern - “that there is are insufficient”)

Abstract – Methods Paragraph
Make statement about the Steering Group influence on the costing framework to delineate the different options – key variable in the evaluation
Move the different model description to the methods section

Abstract – Conclusions Paragraph
Spelling – “Maximize”

Background – Page 4
Spelling – “Specialty” – first paragraph

Results / Category 1 – Page 8
The last paragraph discusses the financial benefit to the practice – are the monetary numbers compared to zero or to baseline traditional method?
Consideration should be made for more trending / % reporting rather than specific monetary numbers due to practice specific variability that will be inherent in this process.

Discussion – Page 11 – Top page
Spelling “Utilizing”
First full sentence on the page – recommend rewording
Spelling “Maximizing”
Third paragraph – Last sentence – recommend rewording

Discussion – Page 12 – Third paragraph
“Study demonstrates how such as tool can facilitate”
Whilst – change to While

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Medical Training in General Practice in Australia – Page 5
Specifically detail the educational requirements from the preceptors for each level (ie. X # of teaching hours / week) as well as the financial subsidies available at differing levels. These elements are not clear in the document – although the paper is a costing analysis, the revenue might significantly trump the cost and should be referenced if possible.

Methods / Teaching Models – Page 6 and 7
A gap exists in the methods with determining how the Steering group took the survey information and then discussed among themselves what the different percent change would be per each teaching option. What was used for consistency? Member experience? Who / How many people are on that Steering group? Was a repeat survey provided to different practices for broader detail?

Results / Category 1 – Page 8
“Three hours of teaching is required” – by whom? Where is that regulation for teaching time? It is helpful to the reader to know what things are expectations and who has defined them.

It is not clear where some information is obtained – “Preparation time by the supervisor would decrease by 25%” – where does that come from? Is that determined by the Steering group? How was that number obtained?

Results / Category 2 – Page 9
GP Supervisor’s time – defined as 20% increase to supervisor time – where did that come from? Experience from Steering group / other method?

Results / Category 3 – Page 10
Increased Net benefit – where did it come from? Important for reader that author
is concrete about the situations and where conclusions are drawn from.

Results / Category 4 – Page 10

How is the revenue determined in this area? Directly links to the remuneration discussed influences argument.

Table 2 - A column with the information from the first study would be greatly helpful.
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