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Reviewer's report:

The authors have largely addressed my comments. However, two issues remain outstanding.

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

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

The theoretical approach (e.g. grounded theory) used in the analysis is still not provided. To interpret the findings, this is essential. Further details explaining this are necessary.

The small sample was entirely made up of GP teachers. Whilst this does not invalidate the findings, some discussion of this weakness in the study and implications of this is important.

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

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)

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

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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