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Reviewer's report:

General
This is an interesting qualitative review of the process of change in clinical care of people with diabetes. Its focus is rather broader than the title suggests as much of the qualitative material relates to drivers for change in primary care diabetes care other than the protected time educational event and I wonder if a title change might be appropriate, or else a changed emphasis in the Results section, as four out of ten of the interview questions specifically related to TARGET.

The data presented does not allow any clear conclusions to be drawn about the effectiveness of this particular educational intervention either in facilitating changed clinical behaviour or in altering practices attitudes to interprofessional working and learning. This is acknowledged in the Conclusion.

I found the idea of stratifying Practices according to their change behaviour interesting, though using the prescription of a single – albeit evidence-based - prescribing strategy a little arbitrary, and feel more exploration of this would be worthwhile. Is the practice ethos different and do they demonstrate greater commitment to audit and interprofessional working and learning? Another study perhaps.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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)

Methods:
I suspect QSR N6 would be meaningless to many non specialist readers.
I would find a little more descriptive analysis of the analytical method and identification of themes helpful. I presume these themes are the headings of the direct quotes used, but clarification of this would be useful.

The words multidisciplinary, multiprofessional, interdisciplinary and interprofessional are all used but it is unclear if they are interchangeable. Many nowadays would suggest the use of ‘interprofessional’ –defined by CAIPE as ‘when [members or students of] two or more professions learn with, from and about one another to improve collaboration and the quality of care’ as most useful unless there is a clear distinction to be made. (Freeth D, Hammick M, Reeves S, Koppel I, Barr H (2005) Effective interprofessional education; development, delivery and evaluation. Blackwell Publishing & CAIPE; Oxford)

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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