Reviewer’s report

Title: The implementation of a quality system in the Dutch GP Specialty training: barriers and facilitators; a qualitative study

Version: 1 Date: 15 Jan 2017

Reviewer: Jamiu Busari

Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. The paper describes a qualitative analysis of the barriers and facilitators to implementing a new quality system. It is an interesting and informative manuscript worthy of dissemination provided a few minor and essential remarks are addressed.

Title:

For the reader, the title is not informative enough especially for a medical education journal. By this I mean that there is no context to help the reader understand what and where the proposed "quality system" is referring to. This becomes evident in the manuscript, but again not explicit enough for the reader to get whether this has to do with the quality of training and/or practice of the GPs. In this sense, the title does not reflect the content of the manuscript and needs to be addressed.

Introductions:

The introduction is informative and provides an adequate context for the paper. However, there are two issues the authors need to address to justify the rationale for the chosen approach. First, they clearly articulate the global need for a change in the training of general practitioners, but fail to describe the local rationale and how this was made evident. This is particularly relevant for the discussion where the authors attempt to explain why there was resistance to the adoption of the intervention. Secondly, in most quality improvement initiatives and in particular, medical education, it is crucial that it is clear what the local needs or problem that the change actors are attempting to address. For this, a needs assessment is of paramount importance to ensure that the intervention aligns well with the anticipated direction of change (see: Ratnaplan, S. & Hilliard R. (2002) Needs Assessment in Postgraduate Medical Education: A Review. Medical Education
Online, 7(8)). Therefore should also be some reference to the sort of (local) needs assessment that was performed prior to conception and implementation of this intervention.

Finally, I would also advise that the authors provide a definition/explanation of what they mean by "institute(s)" e.g. do they mean eight single university/institutions or eight regional training clusters consisting of... etc.

Methods and results:

These sections are well described and undoubtedly the strongest parts of the manuscript.

Discussion:

As mentioned above in the introduction, the authors have to provide information about whether or not a needs assessment was performed and how this may have been a potential explanation for the resistance to acceptance of full adoption of the quality system they proposed. The authors need to be clarify whether the comments of the 17 respondents, are representative and truly reflect the views of all GP trainers/supervisors in the Netherlands i.e. generalizability. As the paper reads now, it appears as if the authors just wanted to share the factors that hindered or contributed to the successful implementation of their quality system, without providing sufficient information to the reader about the rationale for the choice of the intervention and insight into whether or not there was "buy-in" of the constituencies they were being served/represented.

I think that if the authors are willing and can manage to effectively address the few points raised above, then it would be a well balanced manuscript suitable for acceptance.
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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:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

'I declare that I have no competing interests'

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal