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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has the intention to investigate the effectiveness of an intensive multimodal training intervention aimed at improving GP's work-related health and psychological well-being. The idea might be valuable and interesting to the readers of the journal - researchers, as well as practitioners. The paper has many advantages - interdisciplinary approach, quasi-experimental design, clear description of contribution to the literature, relevant topic and use of different data source (independent reviewer, self-reports and objective administrative data). Provides some hints on how to develop and improve general practitioners professional training. Involvement of different specialists.

Still there are some concerns that should be revised before I can recommend this manuscript for publishing. Major concerns:

1) Clearer connections to the journal's scope should be described.

2) The authors do not define construct clearly and does not follow clear theory that would connect all measured constructs. The impression is that they took many variables and just tried to look if something related to GP functioning is improved after intervention. Clear conceptual and theoretical framework would increase the clarity and rationale. For example, the concept of psychological well-being (sometimes called well-being) is not defined, as well as job satisfaction or burnout. There are a lot of models how these constructs are defined in the literature of occupational health psychology, and it remains unclear how the authors use them in current paper. For example, the absence of psychiatric symptoms or burnout are not synonymous to well-being. The opinion about mental illness or patient management strategies seem to be out of the scope and not related to the title and purpose of the paper.

3) The authors provide three - four different aims across the manuscript - abstract (first para, front page), abstract (page 5 line 13), page 8 line 46; page 9 line16. This is very confusing for the reader.

4) Training program (MMT) should be explained with more specific details. Like, on which theory it was based on and how; which constructs and how it was intended to change.
Was there a control for attendance in statistical analyses, was there a control of factor that the program was delivered by different specialists. Please provide the explanation why authors think that this program is intensive and multimodal or based on brief systemic therapy. It seems that different teachers used different methodologies - some focused on knowledge enhancement others on attitudes and skills; was this controlled in the analyses?

5) Reference list and literature review part should be extended with more recent publications (only one is 2017 in a current version, others are older); and with more direct focus on the constructs that are central of this study (like well-being, job satisfaction, etc.).

6) The conclusion - implication in page 22 line 41 (…our study suggests that MTP (from a BST approach) could be adopted as part of continuing professional training program...) is not supported with the results. Having in mind that the effects were minor, such statement is speculative and too strong.

Minor concerns:

* Overuse of abbreviations should be avoided.

* Figure 1 and 2 lack clarity.
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