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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting manuscript whose findings will help inform the content and delivery of workshops aimed at improving general practice management of people with OA. Further, given this study was embedded within the MOSAICS Trial, this manuscript will also help understand the ultimate findings of the MOSAICS Trial. Have the main findings of the Trial been published yet? If so, some discussion of the manuscript findings within the context of the MOSAICS Trial findings would be a beneficial addition to the manuscript.

In both the abstract and the methods of the paper, greater clarity is needed in describing exactly how many simulated patient consultations each GP undertook at each time-point. I think it was just one consultation at each time, but this could be explicitly stated for the reader. Further, it could also be clarified for the reader that the latter consultations were also "new/initial" consultations, as opposed to follow-up consultations (of the patient seen at prior time points).

Could you clarify in the methods the exact number of assessors involved in rating the videos, and how many sets of videos each assessor rated?

A total of 15 GPs contributed to data for this study. Although this is a small sample, it is understandable given the onerous nature of study participation, which required GPs to submit to a video-recorded consultation with a simulated patient. However it does raise the issue of how generalizable the findings are from this small sample to both the MOSAICS GPs who did not participate in this study, and more broadly to the wider population of GPs. The authors have briefly touched on this in the discussion but I think a more in-depth discussion is warranted. How many GPs in total were involved in in the intervention arm of MOSAICS, and does this small subset differ significantly from the other MOSAICS GPs? What were the reasons for GPs refusing to participate in this nested study? How generalizable are the 15 GPs to the broader GP population? I think the manuscript would be strengthened by a more in-depth discussion of the limitations of the sample size, and addressing issues of generalisability to the other MOSAICS GPs and the broader GP population, with respect to key sample characteristics.

Do the authors have any recommendations for how the workshops can/should be refined, in light of the findings from this study? Any changes to course content? Timing? Duration? Including
suggestions in the discussion would be helpful for other organisations/groups looking to implement similar behaviour change workshops for GPs.

Minor point:

BCI has not been defined in the abstract, and this abbreviation is not used later in the manuscript.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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