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Reviewer's report:

Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The objective of the study is to describe the perceptions of local stakeholders towards the introduction of a nurse-led walk-in clinic.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described
This is the weakest aspect of the article. It is a qualitative study based on individual interviews. You would expect to find references to the key methodologic aspects of qualitative research that relate to trustworthiness of the data, saturation of the data and reflexivity (the degree of involvement of researchers with the issues and the step taken to assure appropriate distance when analysing the data). There is nothing there. Figure 1 – which is not a figure by the way but a table- does not help and is not a conceptual framework. The relationship with Donabedian classical framework on quality of care is not obvious. I guessed that the “sub-headings” in the different boxes of the table relate to questions asked in the interviews. No information is given on Hollander’s framework. We have no idea of the number of researchers who analysed the data. No information is given on the 14 stakeholders who refused to participate and the impact on the representativeness of the study. Interviews of two cannot be called focus groups

3. Are the data sound?
With no reference to saturation and description of the non-respondents, it is difficult to judge if the data is sound. The results section is incredibly linear and superficial. There is no analysis per say. Do different stakeholders have different views ? There is attempt to identify core themes.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Not for this kind of study. See above.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Those sections are mere repetitions of the results. There is even an additional quote- which is not the place in this section. The discussion is very superficial

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
No.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   The abstract was not provided.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes