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Reviewer's report:

1) The title reflects the content accurately and is clearly defined.

2) The method is appropriate and is partly defined; the sampling method for the "random" case could be defined more clearly, I think there could be more clarity about the nature of the analytic method used in analyzing the transcribed discussions. How were the texts analyzed exactly? This needs to be stated.

3) The data appear sound, although could be triangulated with a participant or animator from the group and with the presenters whose cases were discussed. The limitation of only verbal information used is clear; the limitation that only two out of a potential 87 case discussions are analysed is an important limitation on the results which could be more explicitly acknowledged. Are these cases in any way to be considered "typical"? The report could have been strengthened by analysing more than two cases. Reasons for limiting this need to be identified.

The content of the paper is interesting to anyone who has attended a Balint Group.

4) The writing is at times somewhat repetitive and verbose and could be made much more concise. This would aid intelligibility greatly, especially for a GP audience. The writing needs a general editorial tidy up to reduce duplication and make the language clearer.

5) Most GPs will be familiar with Balint; few will have heard of Lacan or be in anyway familiar with how his work fits into modern psychotherapeutic understanding. This paper could be more useful to GPs if there was a small section explaining how Lacanian ideas work. Alternatively, the principal idea, that the Balint discussion offers new perspectives and changes participants ways of looking at things, could be demonstrated without specific reference to a Lacanian framework.
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Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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