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**Reviewer’s report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions
- nil required

Minor Compulsory Revisions
- is the data for GP numbers correct at the present time, or is the number of non principals higher?

Discretionary Revisions
- 1- The study appears limited in the choice of participants in that GP participants had to have at least 50% of their workload in the secure environment. While this is accepted as a possible choice, note should be made of the effect of this sampling on the results. Eg those working less that 50% may have been able to compare the ease of data collection with other areas of their portfolio.

- 2- Another limitation is that only the participants who submitted supporting information were invited to a follow up interview. Those who did not provide supporting information may have been able to provide valuable insights into the difficulties faced in collecting information, and the perceptions in the GP environments about the possible difficulty in achieving this.

-3- Comparative data between those providing supporting information and those who did not would have been interesting

- 4- The authors effectively explore the difficulties for this group of GPs. They suggest that the service commissioners could provide support for GPs. The paper might be expected to make some stronger recommendations, in the light of all the information received. Eg the RCGP is reported as stating that the GPs should be supported.

**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.