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Reviewer's report:

1. Physicians are the locomotives of healthcare industry. As such, researches about how to motivate physicians to improve quality are very improvement.

2. The title of this article indicated that this study would specify expected and unexpected opportunities. This is a very interesting perspective and I as most readers anticipate the authors clearly pointed out what are expected and what are not in the end. This article as it is does not give us a clear picture of this kind of classification.

3. The methods section is confusing. It only says that the University Health Network conducted a pilot study. Is this referring to the PQII or the evaluation of PQII? PQII itself and the performance assessment of PQII are two distinctively different things.

4. What is this article's bearing on medical education? This article is closely related to quality management, but why does it have to do with medical education? The authors need to have more justification in this regard.

5. Table 3 was not mentioned in the main text. The readers need to know when they should refer to that particular table.

6. Table 2 and 3 list quotes from the review session. They consist of statements from individual participants. Are there repetitive themes? For qualitative researches, we can still categorize the responses and see whether there are trends or consensuses among respondents.

7. Can Table 2 and 3 be integrated into one table?

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.

No

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable
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