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Reviewer's report:

A real time locating system observes physician styles during walk-rounds: a pilot study

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes – they wanted to investigate unobtrusively the patterns of walk-rounds (in the UK I guess we would call these “teaching rounds”)
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes
3. Are the data sound? Yes – they admit to the slight limitations in saying exactly where attending was
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes

The only slight problem that I have is in the reporting of the number of participants. Under Methods I think the authors should make more clear that 8 physicians participated and that the behaviours of four are reported in more detail.

It would be of interest to know how many patients were reviewed on the walk-rounds, although they may not have the data?

I was interested that the average on a teaching round was just 33% in the room – this matches pretty much the proportion of my rounds spent at the bedside and my rounds are business rounds. The follow up study could use Video Ethnography to see what is done in the room and what is discussed and done in the hallway and conference room (e.g. could use a GoPro camera system?).

These various styles are well known in medicine, but have not been properly defined up to now. I think this should be published to then allow us to open up
the walk-round (teaching round) to further study of which approaches are suitable for what types of teaching and learning, and which are more acceptable to patients.
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