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Reviewer's report:

The topic of this review, impact of patient feedback, is of great importance due to the focus on letting patient having a say in health care. However, I am not sure about some of the choices in the review.

It is clearly stated that it is about patient feedback and that studies on multi source feedback (MSF) was not included. Still in the results it seems some studies with MSF is included (last paragraph page 7).

Why was earlier reviews included in this study and not the single studies that fitted the purpose? Connected to the aim it is clearly stated that the review focuses on feedback on an individual doctor, while the aim points to the more general impact. Although it is possible to guess what the authors have thought, the link is not clearly presented. Especially as it is written that some studies include leaders/chiefs.

The results of the reviewed RCT seems to be very clear, there were no difference between the groups. Still a lot is written about within group changes. As this RCT seems to be the strongest study on causality, it should heavily influence the conclusion.

Throughout the results, it should be included information about the design of the studies to help the reader in assessing the strength of the findings.

Part of the results is more a discussion and should be moved to the discussion section. Some parts comes across as if the authors have included parts of the discussion of the included papers. Only the empirical findings of the reviewed papers should be presented in the result section (or the readers should be made very clearly aware if this is not the case).

How can included studies in English etc avoid duplication?

The abstract should give some information of the type of studies included.
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.
Unable to assess

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.
Not relevant to this manuscript

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