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Reviewer's report:

General

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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)
This study reports the results of a qualitative survey to general practitioners regarding their experience with home enteral nutrition. The study demonstrates that the majority of the GPs interviewed have a negative experience with home enteral feeding and feel they require more education, support and resources to manage these patients. Overall, the paper is well written and the methodology is clear.

One of the main limitations of this study is the small sample size. This is elaborated on in the discussion. It would be helpful to know the characteristics of the GPs who participated in the study – were they from different regions of the country and was there any difference in attitude towards enteral feeding according to time from graduation? Were there any factors related to GPs that predicted a negative experience with enteral feeding. In the GPs who responded, how many patients did they manage with home enteral feeding – if the numbers are very few, then it is possible that they will require continuing education to maintain their competence.

Selection bias also may have affected these results. The patients that responded to the survey may have been those individuals who were most dissatisfied with current their training in the management of home enteral feeding. This should be made reference to in the discussion.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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