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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well conducted piece of qualitative research looking at the views of GPs towards patient adherence to lifestyle changes and medication. Although the question is not novel, this piece of work will contribute to the literature on this topic. The research question is well defined. The methods are appropriate and well-described. The data are sound and the discussion well balanced.

The authors should seriously consider using a native English speaker to edit the work. I could understand the gist of what they were trying to say but at times the English grammar used could be construed in a different way. In addition there are various spelling mistakes which a spell check would not detect eg lose for loose.

- Minor Essential Revisions
  Ä. Grammatical editing of the English.
  Ä. The authors have chosen to separate the results and discussion which fits this study well. However, discussion enters into the results at times eg “From the dynamic and productive discussions in the focus groups, we may conclude that this subject was of substantial concern to GPs.” An alternative explanation is that there were strongly opposing views which stimulated the groups. This should appropriately be in the discussion. Other areas of discussion entering the results should also be moved.
  Ä. I do not understand the sentence “In emphasising this, doctors may minimise their own responsibility and try to shift the blame to the liberal marginal conditions in which they are functioning.” Can this be clarified?
  Ä. The conclusion is lengthy and reiterates much of the discussion. It should be possible to shorten it to one paragraph with the key findings/recommendations.
  Ä. The authors comment on the terms “compliance,” “adherence,” and “concordance” in Dutch as having one term. They do have different meanings in English with different emphases. Having commented on the terms, the authors then use them interchangeably through the paper. A consistency should be adopted. The GPs seem to be talking about compliance “a more doctor centred paternalistic approach.”

- Discretionary Revisions
  Ä. The authors introduce the literature on compliance in the discussion “especially the literature from the patient’s perspective. However, their present study is not discussed fully in the light of this literature. Either the discussion should be included or this part of the discussion shortened.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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
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