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Reviewer's report:

minor essential revisions

I found the paper generally good but in parts a little confusing to read. In some instances I felt as though this paper was based upon a small element of a larger study and some information presented was either not related to this paper or needed some further explanation as the context of it wasn't fully explained eg:

1) Results - thematic analysis - figure 1 - the model is inserted but not referred to or explained in anyway in relation to this paper - it is left for the reader to unpick themselves - is the model needed for this paper?

2) Discussion - Patients attitudes to therapeutic interventions - c) negative relationships - "again the 3 concepts are interlinked" - distrust/dishonesty & concealment of a problem or the concepts a,b,c or 3 other concepts - I seem to be missing what is referred to here

3) Discussion - paragraph 5 sentence 2- this finding is especially worrying because referral to secondary care was viewed as being of little value to participants - By whom? this made me think it is a finding from staff and therefore doesn't fit within the remit of this paper

minor issues not for publication

Background

1) line 2 typo - implication sand impacts / implications and impacts

2) throughout you use SBI & BI as shortened I prefer using whole words for reading ease

3) paragraph 3 you use the word doctors and elsewhere too and also within the paper you use GPs I would prefer GP throughout

4) paragraph 5 last sentence "as identified by the authors of this qualitative study - do you mean your study or the literature referred to as this isn't clear

5) in the final paragraph you list aim " as Attitude towards screening and treatment for problem alcohol use in primary care, and also in Abstract - results. However in the results section of the paper in both 1 & 2 you add the term therapeutic interventions and use this throughout this section

Methods

6) Participants - I get a little confused here do you mean all GPs on the central
Treatment List in Eastern region of Ireland - just it isn't obvious to a reader who doesn't know the geography of the country and the number stated drops to 150 from the figure the paragraph above 277 so it is also a little confusing and just needs more explanation that it is this specific region

7) data collection for me I would not need to know SD of interview length

Results

8) sociodemographic and addiction characteristics - the table is inserted I would not use the percentages also within the text

9) patients experience of being screened you refer to AUDIT which is mentioned in the text elsewhere but also introduce CAGE which is not mentioned previously

10) there are lots of sub sub headings - re they all necessary as they will add to the word count eg c) patients relationship with healthcare professional has a sub heading positive relationships and another negative relationships yet the text under each subheading describes these and would flow well without them

Discussion

11) two thirds of the way through paragraph 2 the section beginning Instead, exploration doesn't make sense and isn't a full sentence
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