Peer Review Report

Review Report on GPs' experience of public-private partnerships to develop team-based care: a qualitative study

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Stefan Essig
Submitted on: 01 Sep 2023
Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606453

EVALUATION

Q 1 **Please summarize the main findings of the study.**

GPs' views on p-p partnerships to integrate nurses into GPs' practices

Q 2 **Please highlight the limitations and strengths.**

The study adds important, new aspects to the emerging topic of team-based work and nurses in Swiss primary care. Nevertheless, some revisions in terms of clarity (title, results, conclusion) will have to be performed before the manuscript is ready for publication.

Q 3 **Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.**

MAJOR
Title and abstract
- "Public-private partnerships between public health entities and private primary care practices to develop team-based care" The title sounds more like a review paper than a qualitative study. Make the title more precise to give a better idea of the article.

- The meaning of the sentence "GPs would also have to be more respectful of its (the p-p partnership's) framework" in the abstract remains unclear. Did the GPs say that they did not respect the rules? And who said that they "have to be more respectful"?

- "Last aspect was the academic support (…) provided by an academic department…". What is the result - Was the support challenging or helpful?

- Introduce the tripartite partnership/ the department to understand how the finding is related to the research question on p-p partnerships between GP practices and public health authorities.

- The link between the conclusion and the aim and findings is weak. The conclusion says that the examined p-p partnership is an opportunity to understand each actor's needs better. What were the needs? And how do we know about each other's perspective if only GPs were interviewed?

Body text
- Mirror the above changes of the abstract in the body text.
- "P-p partnerships" do not have a clear definition but mostly follow a pattern of private investments in public entities. Your type of p-p partnership is different and should, therefore, be introduced by embedding it in the bigger picture of p-p p.

– What is the “facilitator’s project diary”? How does it fit into the framework of the study, which is a qualitative analysis of interviews with GPs? Can you drop the diary notes from the analysis and use them to discuss your results in the results section?

– Other research groups from other institutions in Switzerland, e.g., Bern University of Applied Sciences, Basel University, and Lucerne University, published studies covering similar aspects. Still. Introduce and discuss their results in the manuscript.

– The conclusion is much clearer than the one in the abstract. Incorporate and summarise the essence of the information in the abstract.

MINOR
– Remove the comments and add references here: “REF eval and project”, “REF project”, “REF report,” etc.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 **Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?**

See above

Q 5 **Are the keywords appropriate?**

Yes

Q 6 **Is the English language of sufficient quality?**

Yes

Q 7 **Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?**

Not Applicable.

Q 8 **Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)**

See above

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 **Originality**

Q 10 **Rigor**

Q 11 **Significance to the field**

Q 12 **Interest to a general audience**

Q 13 **Quality of the writing**

Q 14 **Overall scientific quality of the study**

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 **Please make a recommendation based on your comments:**

Major revisions.