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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Authors,

I am pleased to read the revised manuscript. This version effectively covers all major concerns I and the other reviewer raised in a much more concise presentation.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

Yes, the question is much clearer. Essential background information on the current family medicine situation in Hong Kong is presented.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

Yes, the authors did a great job describing what has been done to collect and analyze qualitative interview data, instead of using methodological jargons. I believe the family doctor model is now much clearer to the readers, especially when it comes with appropriate reference. The authors state that no QDA was used which I think it is fine as the data analysis section has been adequately well written.

In my previous comment, I raised the issue about how the questionnaire might affect subject selection process because the text did not make it clear; however, this revised version has made it acceptable.

3. Are the data sound?

Yes.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Yes. The discussion and conclusion are much more relevant to the study. Also, I now agree with the authors that the traditional chinese medicine can be present in a separate paper.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes. The added discussion on study assumption and reflexivity is useful.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes. The writing has been greatly improved as long as a non-native English speaker like myself can tell. All of my previous concerns were addressed. However, I would like to point out one more important point. On page 19, second paragraph, I think it should read ‘being too familiar’ rather than ‘being to familiar.’

I would like to congratulate you on your hard work and I look forward to seeing the published version in the journal.
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