

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)	Enhancing the quality and safety of care through training generalist doctors: a longitudinal, mixed-methods study of a UK broad-based training programme
AUTHORS	Bullock, Alison; Webb, Katie; Muddiman, Esther; MacDonald, Janet; Allery, Lynne; Pugsley, Lesley

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Professor Olwyn Westwood Queen Mary, University of London, United Kingdom
REVIEW RETURNED	22-Jan-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a highly topical issue which is worthy of exploration - The methodology and data analysis were appropriate. The only concern is that, whilst there was data from the questionnaire for the comparator group, it seemed that qualitative data for the comparator group participants was not available. It would add to the credence of the study if the authors were able to demonstrate equivalence with the BBT. If there is interview data available for the comparator group, then this should be included. Overall - a well-written paper worthy of publication
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Katja Goetz University Hospital Schleswig-Holstein, Campus Luebeck Institute of Family Medicine Germany
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Jan-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	Different aspects are missing: - a clear description of data analysis within the method - a presentation of response rate - a discussion of CanMed roles which could be an important for training-programme Furthermore, the discussion needs restructured and a limitation of the study should be added.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Editor Comments:

1. Please include the study design and country in the title. This is the preferred format of the journal.

Response: Title now refers to “a longitudinal mixed-methods study of a UK broad-based training programme”.

2. Please include and complete both the STROBE and COREQ checklists, where relevant.

Response: COREQ was completed and submitted with original submission.

STROBE has now also been completed.

3. Please use the Vancouver convention when referencing throughout your manuscript.

Response: Referencing style has been changed to Vancouver

Reviewer: 1

1. This is a highly topical issue which is worthy of exploration - The methodology and data analysis were appropriate. The only concern is that, whilst there was data from the questionnaire for the comparator group, it seemed that qualitative data for the comparator group participants was not available. It would add to the credence of the study if the authors were able to demonstrate equivalence with the BBT. If there is interview data available for the comparator group, then this should be included.

Response: We did not collect interview data from the comparator groups so are unable to include qualitative data from comparators

Reviewer: 2

1. Add a clear description of data analysis within the method

Response: We have elaborated our description in the Methods section. In relation to the questionnaire data, we state: “We analysed the data using SPSS to explore variable frequencies, specifically participants’ responses to statements on 10-point or 6-point scales. Scales were reconfigured as 3-points to avoid small numbers in some analysis cells in the comparisons, where we used the Mann-Whitney U test for nonparametric data. (18) Missing data were not included.”

The reference we added:

(18) Field A (2013) *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics 4th edition*. London: Sage Publications

We have added detail to our description of how we analysed the qualitative data: “The interview and focus group data were managed in Nvivo and analysed using a coding frame (matrix) of a priori themes developed from programme documentation and the wider literature. Using the initial coding frame, this directed content approach to the analysis (ref) entailed: (1) independent coding by a member of the project team who populated the matrix with extracts from the transcripts; (2) identification of sub themes, expanding the coding frame; (3) concordance testing of coded samples; (4) discussion within the project team, leading to the integration of themes; (5) validation via feedback of interim findings to key informants.”

Ref: Hsieh HF, Shannon S. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research* 2005;15:1277-1288

2. Add response rate

Response rate: Responses rates are included in Table 1 and we now note this in the table title. We are only able to report these for the BBT cohorts.

3. Add discussion of CanMed roles which could be an important for training-programme

Response: We have referenced Frank JR, Snell L, Sherbino J. (editors) CanMEDS 2015 Physician Competency Framework. Ottawa: Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada. 2015 and developed the discussion, notably drawing attention to the concept of collaboration which is emphasised in the revised competency framework.

4. Furthermore, the discussion needs to be restructured and a limitation of the study should be added.

Response: We have developed the discussion in light of the CanMEDS addition (see above). In doing this, we have split the originally overly-large paragraph which helps the reader distinguish key arguments in the discussion.

We note that study limitations are already included in the discussion where we state:

“Nonetheless, we recognise that we consulted a small sample of workplace supervisors for their perspectives on the benefits or drawbacks of broad-based training and an extended longitudinal study could further explore whether observed changes are maintained over time.”

Further, the journal carries a ‘strengths and limitations’ box and here we note:

- As participants in a new programme, a weakness is the potential biased responses of BBT trainees.
- We acknowledge that our sample of workplace supervisors is small, and we recognise the need to collect more data from trainers.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Katja Goetz Institute of Family Medicine, University Hospital Schleswig-Holstein, Campus Luebeck, Germany
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Feb-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	Please have a look on your references and used the style from BMJ Open.
REVIEWER	Professor Olwyn Westwood Queen Mary, University of London United Kingdom
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Feb-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a much improved manuscript, where the suggested changes made have augmented the text and the statistical analysis, which means it is worthy of publication. Simply needs some editorial work done at the journal to ensure appropriate grammar in a few areas