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Reviewer's report:

This is a paper on GPs’ and corresponding patients’ characteristics and experiences about the use of a delayed prescription strategy used within a cluster-RCT.

It is well written covers an important topic and I enjoyed reading it. I do have some recommendations that may improve the manuscript at some points.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

The abstract would benefit from a work-over. Be more precise. What was the GPs response rate? What is the main finding of your study, report where your analysis resulted in significant correlations? Your manuscript does not justify your conclusions in the abstract. All you could say is “educational efforts in Norway to promote delayed prescribing within General Practice may focus on these diagnoses”

The terms “wait-and-see-prescription” and “delayed prescription” are used synonymously throughout the manuscript. Do these terms really mean the same, or does “delayed prescription” refer to a more rigid and clearly defined procedure strategy in contrast to a “wait-and-see-prescription”, which may be a part of routine consultation style and used by many GPs at various occasions maybe without explicitly naming it. Consequently provide more information on the interventional package that has been used in the trial. Was “delayed prescription” one of several “tools” for the consultation (if so, what were the others) that was offered to the GPs or did the intervention mainly relied on this concept? Furthermore, was “delayed prescription” defined within a SOP with a fixed interval at which patient would be able to pick up their prescription, or were they free in picking up their prescription at their own choice?

Thus, please be clear about the concept used in your study and use either “wait-and-see-prescription” or “delayed prescription” when describing your study.

The conclusions section of the manuscript is a bit disappointing. Maybe you want to draw more practice related conclusions, if applicable. For example your study suggests that the concept of “delayed prescription” can be easily integrated within a routine consultation as an add-on to other communication techniques that aim at improving prescribing. You could also address ethical considerations to the concept of “delayed prescription”, is it without any question to leave the patient alone with the important decision weather to take an antibiotic or not?
Minor Essential Revisions:
Please make your questionnaire on GPs reasons for issuing wait-and-see prescriptions available for the readers, either by adding it to your manuscript or provide a reference where it can be accessed.
Please check for spelling errors.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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