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Reviewer’s report:

General

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

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)

Please attend to the structure of presentation of the paper. At present it is rather fragmented. You could more firmly embed your illustrative quotes into the text and bring forward some of the literature review material (eg critique of ‘community’ on p 18) that currently appears within the Discussion -- a section I think logically includes discussion of the study itself (but in light of previously discussed theory/literature). In my estimation a modest reorganisation will strengthen the paper immeasurably

The repeated reference to the "academic general practitioner" seems pedantic...why not just 'the researcher'?

An example or two could be made of the 'action taken' on p 20

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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.
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