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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)

1) Please move: “Our approach differs in that we have included a broader spectrum of professional expertise in primary care, including those already skilled in SDM and those with little previous knowledge. Moreover, in our analysis we consider the patient/ practitioner interaction as well as the social and organisational context of decision making.” from the introduction section to the discussion section.

2) Please edit all included references.

3) Please provide reference from the BMJ for the IPDAS (p.4 out of 20)

4) Please be consistent with the use of SDM (shared decision making or SDM)

5) Please provide the definition of FG1 etc.

6) Please move: “Our findings suggest that at both institutional and individual levels practitioners had different understandings and perceptions of their roles and relations in respect to patients that ranged from an implicit understanding and commitment to the principles of SDM that was patient-centred to a protective paternalism that was more practitioner-centred. Although almost one third of participants in focus groups were not GPs, discussions tended to be GP dominated or led. This therefore shaped our selection of representative quotes.” from the results section to the discussion section.

7) In the discussion section, add reference for: “In other words, for Elwyn, new forms etc…”
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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