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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major revisions:**
- the research question and objectives should be more clearly stated after the introductory section
- the nine themes overlap and require further refining - there seem to be themes in relation to information exchange, maintaining the network but less evidence of debate? A "miscellaneous" theme undermines the authority of your analysis - a rigorous qualitative analysis would seek to explore this theme in more depth.
- these themes should be discussed more thoroughly in relation to social networking theories, for example how networks evolve and the importance of tacit knowledge. The work of John Field and Franz Capra is recommended.
- clarification and further discussion about the significance of a predominantly UK sample is required, as this is mentioned several times.
- the belief that research projects could have been more significant in the postings needs critical evaluation, as I suspect this reflects an academic sense of priorities rather than clinicians.

**Minor and discretionary revisions - please refer to annotated paper attached.**

The authors should carefully proof read to check for changes in tense. In my opinion the online discussion group should be written about in the past tense, to avoid confusion and keep the focus on this study. I have highlighted in yellow where I think there’s confusion of tenses.

Thanks
Wendy
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