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Reviewer’s report:

This paper provides useful insights into the different interviewing skills required in qualitative research compared to the clinical setting. Practical techniques are outlined to identify and overcome potential inadequacies in interviewing methods. Examples of interview excerpts illustrate theoretical concepts; this can be particularly useful for the novice researcher.

Major compulsory revisions:

1) Discussion: The interview excerpt and corresponding explanatory section does not fit in the discussion and should be placed in the results section. “For example, late in the interview with one GP......which was a critical turning point of the interview enabling reflection on the need for behaviour change.”

Minor compulsory revisions:

2) In fact, the article would be enriched by providing some examples of interview excerpts illustrating appropriate interviewing techniques.

3) The paper would benefit if a box was added summarising key points, e.g using headings such as “common pitfalls” “interviewer skills needed” “techniques to identify and overcome inadequacies”.

4) page 9, first sentence – word missing “Paraphrasing to check interpretations can be an inaccurate ? …

5) page 10, last sentence – rather start the sentence with “the GP researcher during later interviews …” to distinguish context from the previous sentence about author Arber.

6) Page 11, amend for clarity: “Assumptions from CLINICAL ‘insider’ knowledge

7) The last sentence in the conclusion is not supported by this article. Maybe change to “There MAY also be reciprocal benefit in adding skills of reflexivity to the clinical encounter and thus improving patient centred care.” This needs to be tested in future research?

Discretionary revisions:

8) A box may be added which summarises definition of terms, e.g. reflection-in-action
**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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