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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is an interesting article, giving a rare inside look at what happens between physicians and their patients.

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? Yes, they set out the problem clearly, and motivated its choice well.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? Yes, in general. The only aspect not very clear from the description is how the two sets of data (from observation and interviews) were integrated. While it is made very clear how the interview data were analyzed, this is less clear about the observation data. The two settings in which the research was done are mentioned in the overall aim (p.5) before the authors indicated that they would use two settings.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled? Yes, as far as it is possible to judge in this kind of research.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes, generally. I would recommend that the authors put in a paragraph to transition from the three factors to the four steps. Perhaps a heading for each of these components should be considered, with an introductory paragraph. As it is, the transition is too abrupt.

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

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes

7. Is the writing acceptable? The article generally reads well, but there are a few typing errors (e.g. Factor 2, second sentence, they wayâ€” instead of the wayâ€” and next paragraph to beeâ€” instead of to beâ€”). In some sentences the English is not very good (e.g. the last sentence on page 6 in the paragraph starting with We usedâ€”). I suggest the following wording instead of what is there: data were analyzed concurrently with data collection, so that the main issuesâ€”

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

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The aspects I address in the general comments should be addressed.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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