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Overall this is a well-written paper covering a topical area within healthcare. The background is clear, and the findings relevant and drawn directly from the analysis. Detailed comments are below, several of them refer to typographical errors or small mistakes in use of language:

P4 line 7 enquiries rather than inquires

p4 line 23 unclear sentence, 'a gatekeeper and a career'?

p4 24 was not were

page 5 51 awkward sentence, be consistent in use of capitals (or not) in OOH

Page 6 6 what was the 'previous observed activity'? Additional background information here would be useful to provide a more detailed picture of the setting for the data collection.

p6 5 regarding the number of years in employment, is this employment in their current role, or within a similar role more broadly? For those unfamiliar with the Norwegian setting, more information on the clinical requirements for undertaking this role would be useful.

p6 13 what was the basis of recommendation by others? Perceived willingness to participate?

p6 35 was there an average duration? Did this differ for the individual interviews and focus groups, as I imagine the focus groups took longer on average? Were they recorded, if so was this audio and/or video?
I appreciate it's not part of this analysis directly, but I would like to know more about the time prior to interviews and focus groups - was this before Sept '13, or as part of this time period?

For the semi-structured interview guide, could you provide this as an appendix so the reader can see additional questions? The main question addresses the needs of the research question but it would be good to see others, especially how the individual interviews and focus groups were structured.

Were all original texts re-evaluated throughout the analysis, or a sample? What is the background and experience of the researchers doing the analysis? Were the transcripts returned to the participants, or a summary of results?

I would like to see more information from the quotes used. Whilst they do illustrate the finding being made, it would be useful to have additional (anonymous) information attributed to it, such as whether they were a leader, and length of employment/experience. For example, the quote on lines 35-39 sounds very formal and professional - was this said by one of the leaders? Similarly, is it possible to edit the table showing characteristics of participants? For example, participant 1, female, leader, length of employment 2 years.

Fewer, not less, and their, not theirs.

May read better if 'were not able to' instead.

todays needs missing apostrophe.

ad not add.

did anyone provide any ideas for what an effective campaign would, or would not, include

and 49 do not rather than don't

too not to
p10 51 paid not payed

p10 56 who suggested this? Do call handlers all have clinical backgrounds? what is the required level of expertise?

p11 7 professionally not professional

p11 15 informants reported, rather than believed?

p11 18 GPs rather than GPS and line 33 originate not origin and 94 alternative not alternate and line 52 have not has

p11-12 lines 60 to 1 - it would be useful to know which level of staff reported this. Was it roughly a majority, or a certain group? Was anything reported about moving between call handling and clerical work and direct patient contact? If possible?

p12 4 does this depend on the type pf calls? Calls similar in nature might be more monotonous than calls which are harder to anticipate the nature of?

p12 12-15 'studies' mentioned in plural but only one reference. Use ref 7 as an example, or provide others.

p12 19 relevance of less physically demanding - was this mentioned by participants, is this seen as a positive by all?

p12 29 employees' not employee's and line 54 informants' and p.13 'list-patients'

p12 35 an increase

p13 19 a pgrase such as 'thought it would' rather than meant?

p13 25 NHS Direct in England has now closed, NHS 111 service, worth adding as a footnote for clarity?
p13 35 complements

p13 48 who rather than that

p13 50 employees'

p13 54 this variation in sample should be mentioned earlier.

p14 20 good information to the public and in plenty of time.
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