Reviewer’s report

Title: Applying evidence-based medicine in general practice: a video-stimulated interview study on workplace-based observation

Version: 0 Date: 25 Oct 2019

Reviewer: Charlotte Woodcock

Reviewer's report:

Overall this is a well conducted and written study with relevance to the training processes of GPs. The study puts forward two main aims: firstly, to investigate the extent to which GPs and GP trainees recognise each other's EBM behaviour through observation, and secondly, to identify aspects that influence recognition. The manuscript it its current form meets the latter aim of the study, but not the former. In light of this, the authors are encouraged to consider the clarity in how the methods and analysis allow for recognition of EBM behaviour, and for the quality of EBM behaviours to be further discussed in the results and discussion. The introduction tells us that EBM involves a complex combination of evidence, patient preference, and clinical expertise. The VIS interview also asks participants to comment on the role of these three pillars of EBM. This however seems to be where the application of the operational definition of EBM behaviour ends. Although the analysis comments on cases where a trainee may value the evidence base more strongly compared to experienced GPs who rely more on 'mindlines', there seems to be an assumption that all behaviour is EBM behaviour. In the study's discussion, it is indicated that "correct EBM behaviour" (p. 14) exists. However, in its current form the focus of the study is on the ability of participants to recognise others' decision making processes that led to a specific course of action. Not whether that specific course of action was an example of good EBM behaviour, and subsequently recognised as such. Please reword the study's aim more accurately to reflect the study's findings, or if possible the authors are encouraged to return to the data to consider the interpretations of the three pillars of EBM in the interviews and whether these can inform and strengthen the study's findings. For example, are trainees able to recognise good/poor EBM behaviour in the study, and if so do they learn from these ?Also it is claimed that the authors "studied how implicit learning processes take place in daily practice" (p. 12). To study implicit learning processes suggests learning has taken place as a result of the observational consultations and some kind of change has occurred. It is difficult to see where implicit learning has been measured in the current study. It might be more accurate to say something like the current study examined observational consultations where it is often assumed implicit learning takes place. Additionally Throughout the manuscript be careful where reference numbers are placed. Currently they appear before and after full stops. p. 13 line 304 a word is missing in the phrase "When this done"
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