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Response by authors
Thank you for asking us to revise this manuscript. We have taken on board most of the comments and have made major revisions to the paper. These are detailed below.

Reviewer 3 (Hilde Bastiaens)
1. As requested we have provided more detail of the analysis process (page 7-8).
2. We have explained why the analysis was not done in Cantonese (page 7, lines 2-3)
3. We have added the reference mentioned into the discussion section and reference list.

Reviewer 4 (Peter Harris)
1. The paper is both a qualitative study of patients views on consultations AND and a local preliminary validation of the CARE measure, and as such we have made this much more explicit in the title, abstract, methods, results, and discussion.
2. The paper states that sampling was not purposive, but attempts were made as far as possible to get a maximum variation sample, as described in the methods and as shown in Table 1.
3. We have added information on ‘weighting’ of findings throughout the results section.

Reviewer 2 (John Furler)
1. We have added substantial information on the analysis as requested (pages 7-8) and have made the use of the CARE Measure much more explicit throughout the paper.
2. We have reduced the number of sections in the results by use of the ‘CARE Framework’ and by removing some of the raw data.
3. We have added substantially to the discussion and hope this is sufficient to satisfy the reviewer.

Reviewer 1 (Tom Blakeman)
1. We have tried to respond to the five pages of comments by this reviewer and would like to express our sincere thanks for this level of detail and scrutiny. However, we are unable to respond to all of the points raised.
2. In terms of the major compulsory revisions we have;
   a. Substantially re-written the abstract to match the results section more closely
   b. We do not understand why the reviewer feels there is a discrepancy between patients wanting self-help support and judging consultations on getting a physical examination and later outcomes. However, we have added more details in the results about sampling categories.
   c. The aim of the study was to report on patients views on consultation quality, and the extent to which this matched the CARE Measure items on interpersonal care, and as such we do not feel that a detailed re-analysis of issues on physical examination is warranted in the current paper.
d. We cannot understand why basing our study on patients accounts limits understanding of why particular aspects help or hinder quality of consultations.

e. We have now re-written the structure of the results so we hope the section on ‘Assessing holistically’ now answers this query about ‘whole-person care’.

f. Regarding shared-decision making, this was not overtly part of the interview schedule and patients generally did not use this term, but in the analysis we were able to deduce views on this from the transcripts.

g. Methodology. We have substantially added to and re-written this section.

h. The comparison with the CARE measure has now been made more explicit throughout the paper.

i. The CARE Measure has been added as an appendix.