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Reviewer's report:

I found this to be an interested paper and many highly pertinent observations about qualitative research in primary health care are made. The paper though does lack a clear focus around which the content is structured.

Major compulsory revisions

1. The abstract describes the purpose of the paper to be a description of the benefits, challenges and new skills required, where as the results section refers to a consideration of reflexivity and reciprocity. The body of the paper is even less clear about the purpose of the paper. The argument needs to be more cohesive and consistent with a clearer theme developed such as ...eg the role of reflexivity in the development of in-depth interview skills in the clinician...

2. A number of terms are used without explanation such as reciprocity and reflexivity which may be unfamiliar to some readers.

3. The conclusions of the abstract would be standard recommendations for any PhD candidate so more information is needed on the particular nature of in-depth interview skill development that is required in this context.

4. Some sentences are difficult to understand eg page 7 the final sentence of "Findings" and the final paragraph on page 14

Minor essential revisions

NIL

Discretionary revisions

NIL

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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