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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? The question posted by the authors are almost well defined

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Qualitative thematic analysis was a good approach but the authors did not explain why this approach was chosen. Regarding the participants, they used patients and health visitors interchangeable, for instance, in the title they mentioned patient-practitioner relationship and then they talked about health visitors and not patients. No clarification was presented on who are the health visitors, are they clients!

3. Are the data sound? Yes the data looks good but I recommend that they use both sides (Practitioners and patients or health visitors quotes). Data also shows that all practitioners and health visitors are female and do not provide any explanation for it

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Not vividly

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes to an extent, but I think they should use new references (now is 2012), even though the study was done 2008-9.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? yes, but they should clear what relationship they are talking about (patients, health visitor, who are health visitors anyway)

9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes it looks good, just a few improvements for example on page 10 they mentioned "this study found, that I think they should mention "researchers found, etc). Overall, I think this article is interesting for publish especially since we have challenges with evidence based practice.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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.