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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for asking me to review this interesting paper which reports on a study to improve GP engagement with a hospital-based study. I appreciate the thorough approach the authors have taken to this work. The paper, as it stands, however, is let down by poor reporting and I have some suggestions which may help them improve it.

Major Revisions

The paper requires to be reviewed and edited by an English speaking co-author.

The current reporting of the questionnaire is inadequate. After several readings of the paper I remain unclear what the purpose of the questionnaire was. Was it the intervention, developed from the interviews, to improve engagement, or did it collect further data to aid an intervention development. In the methods section (step 2) there needs to be a much fuller description of how the questionnaire’s purpose, what it measured, how it was developed and validated. The results section needs a much fuller description of the data and a detailed table of the questionnaire results. The questionnaire needs to be included as an appendix to the paper.

The background deals in far too much detail with DIAGEST 3. This paper is not reporting DIAGEST 3. Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the intro need to be radically shortened.

Minor Revisions

ABSTRACT

The abstract needs to spell out "CRF"

METHODS

The authors must justify why grounded theory appeared to be the most suitable. In step one, why was a random effect needed - would purposive sampling not have been better?

The authors describe a method of defining data-saturation. Is this a novel technique or should they be referencing others work. Also, are we sure that it was valid to conduct a focus group with only 2 participants???
Typo in section on "mailing and response monitoring techniques." Surely it's "foot in door" and not "foot in mouth" they mean??
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