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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Discretionary Revisions
   Yes but in the background further on the importance of a strong primary care sector e.g. see Starfield B. Primary Care: Balancing Health Needs, Services, and Technology. New York: Oxford University Press; 1998.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes, except for see below re concerns re data saturation.

2. Are the data sound?
   Major Compulsory Revisions
   I have some concerns regarding the assertion in under ‘Data Collection’ that saturation was reached when there is a comment under ‘Strengths and Weaknesses’ that data saturation in each participant category cannot be shown. The number of focus groups held with each participant group should be noted (perhaps in Table 2) and the text under ‘Data Collection’ edited to convey that overall data saturation across but not within groups was reached.

   Recognition 1st sentence: Query if the respondent AGP10 is potentially identifiable and if permission required from participant to include full detail of title and year here?

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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? By and large yes – some suggestions:
   Minor Essential Revisions
Background 3rd paragraph end 3rd sentence: ‘…..involved on in the process’.

Analysis 1st paragraph end 1st sentence: ‘…..Canada).

Analysis 1st paragraph end last sentence: They enable to identify identification of facilitators…..’.

Specificity of research in general practice 2nd last sentence not clear – perhaps exclude the work ‘only’. [Question – did the other participant groups suggest that all were relevant or did they not refer to this aspect at all?]

Relevance of research in general practice 2nd last sentence: ‘…by the other participant categories’. [Suggest you consider replacing all occurrences with participant categories to make this clearer].

Recognition 2nd sentence: ‘…participant categories’

Recognition 2nd last sentence: ‘…patients neither nor the GP’

Pitfalls 1st sentence: The meaning of the word ‘instrumentalising’ here is not clear – consider changing.

Pitfalls 4th sentence: change ‘implicated’ to ‘involved’.

Pitfalls 5th sentence: ‘Such a restrictive…’

Pitfalls 2nd last sentence: ‘…participant categories’

Feasibility 2nd sentence: Consider if ‘from trust based relationship’ should be ‘form trust based relationship’

Improving legitimacy 6th sentence: ‘role of as leaders’

Grounding in day to day practice: change emerged to emerge

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**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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