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Reviewer's report:

The authors are addressing a topic of great interest and intense discussion from a GPs view: quality work. The paper is very well written and I enjoyed reading it, since it reflects many of the experiences I made when discussing about quality of care with physicians. Also the experiences with the computerized medical records are quite the same in Germany. The labelling of the main findings with â€œbottom up perspectiveâ€ and â€œtop down impositionâ€ displays nicely the two opposite points of GPsâ€™ views.

- Major Compulsory Revisions
  none

- Minor Essential Revisions
  1. In the methods section there are many details about the academic degrees of the authors. This information is of no importance for the quality of the paper. I would suggest omitting them.

- Discretionary Revisions
  1. The authors mention that the interviewer was known to at least some of the interviewed GPs. I would mention this as limitation since it could have influenced the statements.
  2. The authors state that some of the physicians participated in APOs. It would be interesting if the statements of these GPs differed from the ones who had no such experience.
  3. The authors mention that the statements were quite unanimous. This is quite surprising for me, because my experience is that many GPs who regard quality work as a professional obligation have also the feeling that there is what the authors called â€œtop-down impositionâ€. And these â€œtop-downâ€ requirements are often in conflict with their individual efforts of quality work. But the findings are the findings.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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