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Reviewer's report:

Why do general practitioners decline opportunities for feedback from trained peers on the quality of appraisal evidence?

The authors of this project have set out to answer a well defined and relevant question. They described their methodology clearly and in sufficient detail. They were able to provide sufficient evidence to substantiate their conclusions. They acknowledged the potential bias of using a sample of colleagues who volunteered to participate in the interviews. They presented the relevant background literature and were able to show how their findings have added to the existing literature on the topic. The writing style is clear and engaging.

Discretionary revision

The only aspect that detracts from the article is the frequent use of abbreviations such as MSF, QOF, GMS, SEA, NES. As I work outside of Britain, these are not familiar to me.

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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