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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions.

The methods section does not clearly explain what they did:

1. What questions did the researchers ask in the semi-structured interview? Did these questions change as the study progressed?

2. How were the participants selected? Tell us something about the participants.

3. Findings: It is difficult to tell whether the four categories produced have come from the researchers or the interviewees.

4. The discussion is very long but does not really discuss the findings of the study (it is more of a literature review).

5. The conclusion is a very long sentence and I find it hard to understand. I do not think that the conclusion has much connection to the findings of this study.

6. The English is often unclear and sometimes difficult to understand at all. The following are some examples of either poor English or minor points of logic or reasoning. Many of these on their own would be 'minor essential revisions' but as there are so many I think they are major revisions:

7. Study Design. I do not know what the first sentence means. Perhaps you could simply state what you did.

8. Study design. 2nd sentence. Again - just state what you did. eg "We used semi-structured interviews to explore the views of GPs on polypharmacy"

9. Findings. page 5. quote 38. 'is been' should be 'is being'

10. page 6 quote 31. needs clarifying. eg aspirin (not aspirine). Asaflow - I do not know what this is. Is it a trade name for a drug? 'blood diluting drug' - does this mean anti-platelet or something else. (Water dilutes the blood but aspirin stops platelets sticking)

11. page 6. 'GP related problems'. 3rd sentence should be 'not critical enough'. (not critically).

12. page 7. EBM related problems. First sentence. This sentence is terribly unclear. I think it means that "GPs feel under pressure from guidelines to
prescribe preventive drugs, even though the harms from polypharmacy may outweigh the possible benefits form individual drugs."

13. last paragraph on page 7. 'One of the reasons GPs ...' (no apostrophe needed - there are a few other examples where GP’s is written instead of GPs)

14. page 9. "Even more, when drugs ..." This is not a sentence.

15. page 9 2nd paragraph. 'compliance'. In my view the words concordance or adherence are more appropriate (as compliance implies that the patient SHOULD take the drugs but does not). Concordance implies that the prescriber and patient have reached an agreement. Adherence is merely whether the patient takes the tablets or not (no judgement as to whether they should or not).

16. page 9 'In controlled trials, adherence is carefully enforced ...' NO comma needed. I think adherence is monitored but it is not enforced is it?

17. page 9. last paragraph. 2nd sentence. 'ambiguous'. I am not sure what is meant here. Would 'unclear' be better? Do the authors mean that there is a balance between harms and benefits?

18. page 10, paragraph 3. 'Obtainment' is not an English word.

19. I am afraid there are quite a lot more grammatical errors.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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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