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Reviewer’s report:

This is a report about a new program for trainees in Intraprofessional collaboration.

It is an interesting variation on interprofessional initiatives. I am not at all sure about the value of the education program as I do not think that the results as justify / confirm the benefits of the program as described. It is noted that the GP trainees already have a year of training in hospital and outpatient settings where presumably there is both inter and intra professional learning occurring.

The justification for the program refers to deficits in communication and information transfer between hospital based physicians and primary care physicians. The reference for this, the JAMA article about deficits in communication in 10 years old. Many health authorities are working to address the problem. Certainly primary /secondary interface issues are /can be problematic, however the solution may be more in the information transfer rather than the need to address intraprofessional issues. A suggestion to the authors is to reframe the justification for this study to look at intraprofessional understanding as one of the factors that may help address the primary secondary divide. Health silos can be seen within secondary care as well - and potentially intraprofessional understanding could be improved between secondary care physicians working in the same institution.

Methods:

The description of the program is quite detailed. It seems that one of the key components was the kick off meeting and the follow up meeting. I wonder if those aspects could be considered separately.

The description of the research design and data analysis is also very detailed. In line 196 remember checking it is more accurate to say the in this group members review the interpretations rather than correct the researchers.

Results:

The small numbers of participants in the focus groups is disappointing. However the most concerning result is that in the GP trainees group "a few" participants( line 427-428) were not
actually eligible for the study as they had not participated in the program. This compromises the validity of the results.

In the section titled Consultation skills - I don't really understand the quote of IM supervisor A.

Discussion:

I am not sure why the CanMEDS roles were chose as the comparator. The CanMEDS roles are an excellent framework. I wonder if there is a similar framework for competencies in the Netherlands that could have been an appropriate comparator.

Overall a small study with results based on a very small number of participants - especially if the non-eligible focus group members are removed. There appears to be some benefit in the collaborative meetings. Maybe a small paper focusing on those interactions could be a good outcome from this work.

There are also corrections needed to the written English as it is a little bit stilted.

Examples: Background line 67

Data collection lines 174-176

Results line 238 "Consultation skills " more commonly refers to the art of the consultation where the physician interviews the patient. Perhaps another term could be used here.

Professionalism section line 267 - the use of the word stern - another word might be better
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