

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	A Survey-based Cross-sectional Study of Doctors' Expectations and Experiences of Non-technical Skills for Out of Hours Work
AUTHORS	Brown, Michael; Shaw, Dominick; Sharples, Sarah; Le Jeune, Ivan; Blakey, John

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Victoria Tippet Aintree University Hospital NHS Trust Long Moor Lane Liverpool United Kingdom Dr John Blakey works at the same NHS Trust, however I have had no involvement in the research submitted, which was undertaken in Nottingham and Leicester.
REVIEW RETURNED	10-Aug-2014

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>In the four summary key points, the final point refers to junior doctors needing training in prioritisation whereas the earlier sections of the article suggest that such training should begin with students at medical school.</p> <p>The statistical tests used appear appropriate but I am not a specialist in statistics.</p> <p>Three focus groups are described, but with 7 participants in total. It is unusual for a focus group to contain just 2 participants, and raises the question of why focus groups were used methodologically, rather than (for example) individual interviews.</p> <p>There are multiple minor errors such as typing errors and missing words which are detailed below. In reporting results of the focus groups, sometimes participant quotes are in italics, at other times not. I would recommend a consistent style approach for all quotes.</p> <p>Typographical corrections: P2 of 24 line 13 – students' – this does not require an apostrophe P7 of 24 line 7 there is an "of" missing between "value" and "prioritising" P7 of 24 line 13 "from" should be "for" (having to care for) P8 of 24 line 38 "leaning to say no" should be learning P 8 of 24 line 58 "section" should be selection P9 of 24 line 19 "Kruskal Wallis tests was" should be were P11 of 24 line 40 "to focus on solely on patients" – only one "on" is needed P12 of 24 line 11 "is" is missing from between "there" and "too great"</p>
-------------------------	--

	The file containing supplementary materials is entitled "Suplimentary_materials" – I am unsure whether this typographical error will be visible to the reader of the finished article.
--	--

REVIEWER	Nicola downer Sherwood Forest nhs trust Sutton in Ashfield Nottinghamshire
REVIEW RETURNED	14-Aug-2014

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is an interesting article that looks at a relevant question to medical training and suggests improvements that could be made to improve the transition from medical student to doctor.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Dr. S.R. Moonesinghe UCL/UCLH Surgical Outcomes Research Centre Department of Anaesthetics and Critical Care University College Hospital London, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	31-Aug-2014

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>I enjoyed reading this paper and think that it would add valuably to the literature in this area.</p> <p>My main comments are on the structure and organisation of the manuscript. There are a number of sections of the methods which in my view would be more appropriately placed in the results:</p> <p>From page 6 line 32: 8 skills were consistently....</p> <p>All the text which follows this in this section (until the middle of page 8 and the description of the survey methods) should be in the results section.</p> <p>Similarly, the "Participants" sub-section at the end of the methods should also be in the results.</p> <p>The abstract should be amended in light of these changes</p> <p>Statistics:</p> <p>Why were means as opposed to medians (or possibly even modes) used to summarise the ordinal data?</p> <p>Are the p-values stated Bonferroni corrected? The number of comparisons for which each test was corrected should be stated please</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

In the four summary key points, the final point refers to junior doctors needing training in prioritisation whereas the earlier sections of the article suggest that such training should begin with students at medical school.

>Agreed and correct. Point 4 replaced with 'Medical students and junior doctors need training in prioritization and decision making processes.'

Three focus groups are described, but with 7 participants in total. It is unusual for a focus group to contain just 2 participants, and raises the question of why focus groups were used methodologically, rather than (for example) individual interviews.

>We find that small focus groups give a good balance between the rich exploration of individual insight and the instant validation of themes and ideas offered by focus groups. Added a line to Focus groups to highlight this point: 'Small focus groups were used as it was felt that larger focus groups would not have given individuals time to explore their experiences in detail while interviews would lack not the validation and embellishment of ideas provided by group discussion.'

In reporting results of the focus groups, sometimes participant quotes are in italics, at other times not. I would recommend a consistent style approach for all quotes.

>Agreed and corrected, italics removed from all quotes.

Typographical corrections:

P2 of 24 line 13 – students' – this does not require an apostrophe

P7 of 24 line 7 there is an "of" missing between "value" and "prioritising"

P7 of 24 line 13 "from" should be "for" (having to care for)

P8 of 24 line 38 "leaning to say no" should be learning P 8 of 24 line 58 "section" should be selection

P9 of 24 line 19 "Kruskal Wallis tests was" should be were

P11 of 24 line 40 "to focus on solely on patients" – only one "on" is needed

P12 of 24 line 11 "is" is missing from between "there" and "too great"

>All agreed and corrected

The file containing supplementary materials is entitled "Suplimentary_materials" – I am unsure whether this typographical error will be visible to the reader of the finished article.

>Corrected just in case.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name Nicola downer

>No critical comments or suggestions for improvement.

Reviewer: 3

My main comments are on the structure and organisation of the manuscript. There are a number of sections of the methods which in my view would be more appropriately placed in the results:

From page 6 line 32: 8 skills were consistently....

All the text which follows this in this section (until the middle of page 8 and the description of the survey methods) should be in the results section.

>Agreed and corrected. 'Results' sub-section added within the Focus groups section with the content indicated.

Similarly, the "Participants" sub-section at the end of the methods should also be in the results.

>Agreed and moved.

The abstract should be amended in light of these changes

>Agreed and updated to include the focus group findings in the results section of the abstract.

Statistics:

Why were means as opposed to medians (or possibly even modes) used to summarise the ordinal data?

> Mean ranks are presented as median/mode graphs were found to obscure some of the subtle, but significant effects. This text has been added to the figure 2 title in order to clarify the issue.

Are the p-values stated Bonferroni corrected? The number of comparisons for which each test was corrected should be stated please

> p-values are Bonferroni corrected (as stated in the method section). The authors did not include the number of comparisons for each test as we believe it is against common practice to do so (we've not encounter this practice in other BMJ Open articles). We are happy to include these but would appreciate the advice of the editorial board on this matter.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Victoria Tippett Aintree University Hospital Liverpool United Kingdom John Blakey works at Aintree University Hospital with me. I had no role in this study.
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Dec-2014

GENERAL COMMENTS	The response to comments about small focus groups is clear but it seems there is a typographical error in the new sentence under "Focus Groups" where it says 'Small focus groups were used as it was felt that larger focus groups would not have given individuals time to explore their experiences in detail while interviews would lack not the validation and embellishment of ideas provided by group discussion.' The "not" after lack appears to be a typographical error.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1 comments:

The response to comments about small focus groups is clear but it seems there is a typographical error in the new sentence under "Focus Groups" where it says 'Small focus groups were used as it was felt that larger focus groups would not have given individuals time to explore their experiences in detail while interviews would lack not the validation and embellishment of ideas provided by group discussion.' The "not" after lack appears to be a typographical error.

> Agreed and corrected. The word 'not' has been removed.