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Reviewer's report:

Overall: The subject remains of interest and it is an area that hasn't been well researched. The paper is better than the original version, but there are still omissions and flaws to address or clarify.

Research question: this is better defined, though I recommend for the sake of clarity that the title, aims, abstract and conclusions are better matched. The authors should also state (in the discussion/conclusion) how future researchers would use the findings from this paper in order to improve future study uptake.

Methods: As noted in the previous review I am concerned that the reported methods do not match the stated methodologies, and phenomenology and grounded theory are referred to in the same sentence; action research methods are also included - line 225. Sampling is said to be theoretical but this is not the case (nor is it purposive). Analysis may have employed grounded theory techniques but there is inadequate description. The descriptions of the 'doctor types' bear resemblance to learning theories but no references are give. If these categories are completely new then the analytical process should be described in much greater detail. My impression is that the methodologies were not prospectively applied with sufficient rigour to guarantee the validity of this paper, and further detail and reassurances are needed if it is to be considered further.

Other details (line no):
93: ‘almost none’ – insert number
94: what is a motivational letter? Presume asking a favour of the GPs/encouraging them to drum up support- if so state it as such; if not please elaborate
95: 'below 10%' - state actual %

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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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