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Reviewer's report:

General

A small scale study, without remarkable results.

What stuck me is the gap between an apparently complicated methodology (transcripts corroborated against the tapes; most significant statements of domain selected by one, then compared by two authors to find similarities and differences leading to different categories and then compared again; many revisions needed to reach consensus) and the very smooth results leading to a rather convincing typology.

I would like to have more information about the degree of agreement at several points between both authors engaged with the analysis.

The results produce a rather descriptive account of ways of dealing with sick listing. I can imagine a more thorough reflection on future actions or research (e.g. a more quantitative assessment of the prevalence of different responsibilities, ways of sick listing and existing practices, combined with a number of characteristics of GPs).

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

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)

p.4: Performing interviews by one author only "to avoid reliability problems" sounds like a funny argument. Reliability is assessed by comparing the records of two individuals; by using only one interviewer, the opportunity to assess reliability is taken away, reliability is not promoted. It is an ostrich attitude.

What next?: Reject because too small an advance to publish

Level of interest: An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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