**Reviewer’s report**

**Title:** Optional part-time and longer GP training modules in GP practices associated with more trainees becoming GPs - a cohort study in Switzerland

**Version:** 1  **Date:** 25 Oct 2017

**Reviewer:** Maria Papadakaki

**Reviewer's report:**

Thank you for this new draft, which shows that the authors invested a lot of effort taking into account all my previous comments and suggestions. I have included some more comments below, which I hope they will be useful during the revision process.

**Introduction**

1. In the revised manuscript, I can see that there are significant improvements in the use of the english language. However, I still feel that some parts of the manuscript, especially in the introduction, are hard to read. Terminology is also very poor at some points. The whole manuscript needs to be thoroughly checked not only by a native speaker but also by a person with a research background who can assist with terminology.

2. The authors have described very well "the problem" behind this study. To my view, some additional justification is necessary for the investigation of certain parameters such as "longer training" Vs short, "part time" Vs full time, trainer's gender….other training characteristics, etc. Is there any evidence on the different impact of these factors that guided their selection?

3. Further to my previous comment, I suggest introducing some study hypothesis that would assist the readers in understanding what the authors attempt to prove. In particular, the authors seek to find factors affecting the number of practicing GPs among various training characteristics. These training characteristics under investigation are defined later in methods (experts decide on what factors to explore with the instrument). However, in the introduction, there should be some justification for investigating these parameters and some initial research hypothesis on what the study expects to find.
Methods

Outcome measures

4. The authors can't conclude whether the factors "favoured or deterred trainees". The analysis can't result to causal relations.

5. The description of the expect panel is more clear now. However, I invite the authors to provide a more scientific description of this process and some scientific evidence in support of this methodology for readers who wish to understand and replicate this process related to the validity of the instrument.

6. Details on the experts' selection process and qualification are necessary.

Results

7. The authors provide some interpretations for the length of training and how it affects the decision process but they don't discuss the other parameters that were not found to affect the number of practicing GPs. e.g. "...before or after fourth year of GP training... localization...gender of trainee and trainer......quality of supervision or teaching" etc..... ". How come these factors were not identified as influential in the current study? What interpretations can be made based on the local GP context and the international evidence?

Study limitations - conclusions

8. The authors need to consider other limitations related to their study design and methods employed (e.g. other factors in parallel to the training program may have affected the decision to become a GP). Alternative study designs (prospective, case-control, etc) that could potentially reduce methodological biases need to be suggested for those who wish to replicate this study.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
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