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Reviewer's Comments:
The authors present a systematic review of 20 articles analyzing patient feedback and its impact on medical performance by physicians and/or medical residents. This is an important area of research and as the authors have identified there is a paucity of reliable literature that supports change in behaviour when using Barr's (2000) adaptation of Kirkpatrick's four level evaluation model.

Overall, we recommend this manuscript be considered for publication following the changes listed below.

We have the following suggestions for the authors:

- Title, Abstract and Introduction should identify that the authors are focusing on physicians and residents and that they are not including medical students.
- The background has some older references that could be replaced with more up-to-date reference material.
- In the Methods section, we would suggest that the authors mention there were two independent reviewers conducting the research.
- Can the authors specify why a ten-year period was chosen as a research period and were there any discrepancies that needed to be resolved by involvement of the third reviewer? The methodology is otherwise well written.
- Please change supplementary Material 3 as a Table in the manuscript, as it will be important for readers to have a summary of the 20 articles analyzed for this systematic review.
- Results are a little difficult to follow.
- Discussion: The authors could consider adding a paragraph on programmatic assessment as well as patient feedback tools that are currently being used and have shown strong validity. The authors may like to reference a unique paper from Dalhousie University, Canada that supports their own work and that referenced in their paper by Sargeant. Joukhadar's study1 has demonstrated that written structured feedback from adolescent patients in undergraduate training using tools like the Structured Communication Adolescent Guide (SCAG) has proved to show behavioral change in adolescent interviewing and communication skills when the students enter residency. This paper is important as it supports many of the initiatives that the authors highlight in their conclusions. Particularly the Structured Communication Adolescent Guide (SCAG) is specific (for adolescents); collected through credible methods by Medical Students (for Rotation Credit); residents (for comprehensive assessment); physicians2 (for CME credit). Contains narrative3 comments and demonstrates behavioral change.

Reference:
2. K. Blake - Section 3 credit opportunity for easy and effective patient feedback, try a communication guide. MOC Tip of the Month, Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada - Published October 2017 http://www.royalcollege.ca/rcsite/publications/dialogue/dialogue-october-2017-e

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

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.
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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