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Author's response to reviews:

Letter for the reviewer

Brest, February 2, 2019,
Concerning our manuscript "Which positive factors give General Practitioners job satisfaction and make General Practice a rewarding career? A European multicentric qualitative research by the European General Practice Research Network." (FAMP-D-18-00281R1) has been assessed by our reviewers. Based on these reports, and my own assessment as Editor, I am pleased to inform you that it is potentially acceptable for publication in BMC Family Practice, once you have carried out some essential revisions suggested by our reviewers.

Comments of Grant Russell

I would have preferred that the authors had given a bit more thought to their responses to the varying subgroups within the analysis. I am troubled by statements such as: "It is difficult to analyse subgroups in a qualitative study, even with the large number of participants and the wealth of data available. The themes could be tested by a questionnaire study in a different survey."

This reinforces my concern about the lack of depth of the analysis - even a comment in the limitations could reassure the reader that the analysis was limited in terms of exploring contextual factors influencing the findings. The resources and collaboration that drove this study would seem to ask for a more substantial and reflective analysis. The search for a maximum variation sample (age gender experience practice organisation payment structure and country of origin) suggested that this was important at some time in the design of the work. The authors clearly aren't keen on such an analysis, and perhaps a reader expecting more could be reassured if the limitations are expressed in the methods and the limitations.

As with the above, the lack of interest in situating the findings in the literature of the world of work will detract from the overall quality of the paper, but is consistent with their stated intent to describe rather than analyse. Styles differ and if the editors feel that these limitations aren't substantial for what the journal is trying to achieve, then this solid paper is, as I have said in my original review, of interest.

Dear colleague,
Thank you for reviewing our paper once again. First, we want to apologise, because we might have given some confusing answers during the last response to the reviewers’ comments.

The overall aim of this project was to get an overview of important elements related to job satisfaction and retention. It was not the aim to focus on the analysis of subgroups but to focus on common themes across the context of different European countries.

In addition, we spend attention on country specific issues. We added some quotes in this part of the article to illustrate these themes and to give this part more credibility.

In the discussion we add some reflections to put these themes in the country-specific context.

We performed a descriptive qualitative research. This research asks a broad sample to describe the phenome of job satisfaction and retention within a specific group of GPs namely those who were at least ten years active as GP and who stayed in clinical practice, working in different settings and countries.

In the discussion, relevant references to existing literature were made using the results of the literature search we published on this topic. However, there is limited literature available on this topic.


Yours sincerely,
Pr Bernard Le Floch, MD.