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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions

Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

1. Introduction could be broader with the range of rate of prescription per consultation in Europe.
2. First sentence of the second part “pelicular challenge” needs to be detailed
3. Select references in the primary care setting, as far it is possible.
4. Curriculum could be replace by “vocational training”.
5. Please translate “référentiel…..”
6. In the last part of the introduction, please explain what is unclear in the appropriateness of these guidelines to general practice specificity.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?

1. What is the value to include GP registrar as they usually prescribe few in primary care?

2. Last part should be clarify for a better understanding especially the sentence:
3. “The items with the lowest global rank were the most highly valued “, there is a misunderstanding between sum of participant’s number and rank. The better way to clarify is to indicate that for each participant when attributing number one is for the important item.

4. It is also confounding in the first and third part of the manuscript.

Are the data sounds?

1. The length of each meeting should be reported as well as the number of competencies mentioned by group.
2. “ Items should be clarified as it was during the meetings.

a. For instance “write a legible and understandable prescription” what part of the prescription should be understandable (drug name, dosage, frequency duration…) and by who?


c. “Inappropriate request” is it medication request? How do you define
d. Identify specific populations” please clarify as adapt prescription to specific population

Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
NA

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
1. In the second part it is necessary to evaluate GP registrar and to ensure that vocational training aimed to improve communication skills.

2. For the fourth part, please explain why it is import in the new context of primary care in France (primary healthcare team).

3. The last sentence of the fifth part is unclear. Do these education-based interventions inefficient? Why French context so different?

4. In the sixth part, a shorter list of items (please replace “the shorter length” which is unclear) does not guaranty it will be implemented in the vocational training, more over if these concept are not enough detailed.

5. The term “unique” is probably too strong some of these items certainly unreported in the UK and Australian framework.

6. In the sentence “in France, it is mandatory to report …incapacity)” a word is missing.

Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
1. Please address, which important items present in UK and Australian guidelines are missing in your results and explain why if possible.

2. The data does not clearly show the importance of shared decision-making, is that a French specificity?

3. First sentence of limitation is useless.

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

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

Is the writing acceptable?
Yes
Minor issues not for publication: some stylistic improvement can be done.

**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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