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Reviewer's report:

General

In my view the authors have done a good job in responding to the review feedback. The particular issues I raised were around

1) The sampling strategy:
This is now described in more detail in the Methods section and is, I believe adequate. 2) The description of qualitative methods is still quite slim but the reader is now at least aware of the theoretical approach. 3) My comment about feeding back existing information on the pilot to GPs was clearly not something that could be addressed retrospectively. It is probably the topic of a further study. It would be interesting to get these GP responses, as many of the issues they raise such as uptake and adverse effects we now have information on.

As I indicated in my original report, I think the results are quite interesting and timely. I am happy to recommend the paper for publication in your journal.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)