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Reviewer's report:
I enjoyed reading this paper as it describe the results of a small mixed methods study about multi source feedback and the implementation of a new method.

I do not think that any major revisions are required.

Background
As a physician working in a different country I would like a bit more explanation in the background about the relationships between the academic hospitals, department chiefs and the physicians. If there an employment relationship? Are Department Chiefs managers, employers, or peer colleagues? Understanding the relative roles of DC and PP would be helpful.

I also found the use of the acronyms possibly unnecessary, if these are commonly used ones in Canada - then OK, but otherwise I would prefer to see the participants referred to as chiefs and physicians. This is not a major concern and as I re read the paper it became less irritating.

Methods
Just a couple of minor points for clarification:

It would be helpful if it was made clearer that the feedback review session is the specific innovation that is being evaluated. Something at the beginning on the second paragraph in the Study background session

With regard to the program itself; I would like to know more about the way the DCs were prepared for this session. What coaching tools were supplied?
Discussion

I wondered how often these reviews - PAR and/or PQII are planned. Is this an annual cycle and is it expected of every physician. Has thought been given to further follow ups of the participating physicians with regard to implementation of changes discussed in the interviews with the Chiefs? Will future reviews PAR / PQII (annual or whatever cycle planned) draw on the baseline established in the first and include questions relating to the previous learnings?

**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.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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