Reviewer’s report

Title: Shared Medical Appointments and Patient-Centered Experience: A Mixed-Methods Systematic Review

Version: 0 Date: 07 Aug 2018

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Reviewer’s report:

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS: To view the full report from the academic peer reviewer, please see the attached file.

REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: This systematic review seeks to summarize patient experiences of shared medical appointments in primary care. The authors used librarians to search multiple databases for peer-reviewed research studies; they appropriately excluded case studies, pilot studies, and editorials. Specific search criteria are included in an Appendix. Restrictive inclusion criteria greatly narrowed the scope of the review, such that 26 articles were included out of 1359 evaluated. The process for selecting articles and extracting data appeared sound, with 2 independent reviewers and a 3rd to arbitrate disagreements. However, the authors declared a very high % of inter-rater reliability without providing details of what exactly they compared, using what specific method, etc. The results summarize the included studies in multiple ways. A strength is that they report on both patient satisfaction (required) and biophysical outcomes (when available). Overall this appears to be a thorough and well-conducted systematic review on a specific type of study, namely, primary care group visits with a clinical component (e.g. lab values) led by a clinician with availability of individual clinical consultation and reporting on patient experience of care. The conclusions are reasonable based on the results.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Inter-rater reliability calculation needs to be clarified.

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

No

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

No
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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