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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The authors’ questions are well-defined and appropriate for a paper of this sort.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The methods are appropriate and well described - the qualitative approach chosen has elicited very useful information.

3. Are the data sound?
There is very little quantitative data, as would be expected from a study of this design. What there is, is sound.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Not qualified to say.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The discussion and conclusion are well written and appropriately draw on the findings from the interviews and discussion group.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
I felt the paper was easy to read and flowed well.

I have no suggestions for revisions as I felt each section to be appropriate. There are a very few examples of duplication eg 'prescribe antibiotics' appears twice in the same list. These can be dealt with in the editing and proof-reading processes.
**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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