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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very clearly concisely written manuscript addressing an interesting research question. I have no concerns about the background or methods.

My comments relate mostly to the development of the 'care support team' intervention and the impact this research had on that

The authors state the GPs in the study had 15 minutes to read about the scheme before the interview. Had they done this? What information were they given to read? Is this the same as GPs will be given in practice or will this now be amended?

Pg 28 - line 31. In this paragraph the implications for the further development and implementation of the 'care support team' are summarised. Can the authors say any more about how they will continue to evaluate GP acceptance?

Did the authors consider any of the concerns the GPs had were founded e.g. how the care support team would communicate back to GPs. In a similar vein to my comment above - can the authors be any more specific about if/how any of the voiced concerns might lead to any changes in the design of the programme or the literature about it?

Minor points

Please clarify if 30 minutes was for the whole interview (including the first section not reported in this manuscript) or not

Pg 9, line 40, please state which data management software was used

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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