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Reviewer's report:

General
With no doubt, by rewriting and clarifying several statements the paper has improved, but overall the provided information is little and relevant only to a small audience.

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

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

To my understanding tables (especially in qualitative research papers) are about to provide a structured overview over the results. As suggested the authors added two tables, but unfortunately these tables cause more confusion than providing more (structured) information. For example, the heading of table 1 indicates that it provides information about GPs’ motives, but in the table (last paragraph) there are also information about (experienced) barriers given. I would suggest either to separate or to rename the box e.g. “GPs’ motives and barriers...”. Furthermore, there is no real association between the text an the information given in the tables. The information given in both tables mostly has to be interpreted by the reader himself. The statements in the tables are too short to be understood without explanations in the main text. This is an important weakness. I'm sorry to say but I think that the tables revealed that the gain in information provided by this study is little.

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

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 of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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