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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is a very well written paper on a topic of great interest to medical practice. It furthers our knowledge in a way that will be very useful to readers.

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
I have a few issues which, if they are addressed, I believe will improve the paper:

1. The Ambassadors

Some comment in the discussion about the choice of ambassador would be helpful. The assumption that Key Opinion Leaders are also good transmitters of information and workshop facilitators is not based on evidence.

A discussion about sustainability issues would also be helpful. Did the ambassadors receive training about the package and how to use it? Were the paid? What was their evaluation of the programme? Would they do it again?

2. The Topics

A discussion on topic choice would also assist others in formulating similar programmes. How were the topics chosen? How were local area issues incorporated? Was a rolling plan of topics developed?

3. The Analyses

The inclusion of percentages when the total is less than 100 is unnecessary and complicates the tables.

Although the numbers are small, some inferential analyses would be useful to identify within group differences: for example, the issue of physician versus non-physician attendance.

4. Needs Assessment
I note in the table that the area of less concordance was whether the programme met the participants' needs. Was a needs assessment conducted prior to the introduction to the program and how was the program tailored to meet the participants' needs?
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