Reviewer’s report

Title: "I can't bend it and it hurts like mad": Direct observation of gout consultations in routine primary health care

Version: 0 Date: 22 Jul 2016

Reviewer: Jennifer Liddle

Reviewer's report:

This is a great study and a clearly written paper. My suggestions relate mainly to the explanations provided about data analysis.

Literature

I appreciate that the lack of more recent qualitative publications may be a result of the time lag between literature searching/writing and the submission and review process. Given the relatively small body of literature in this area, the background and discussion sections would be strengthened by drawing on additional qualitative gout publications from 2014-2016. The paper should also include some references/theory to support the approach taken to data analysis.

Analysis

The analysis clearly benefits from the involvement of a multidisciplinary team with different perspectives and approaches. I would have preferred table 3 to include more information around the specifics of what these different perspectives fed into the analytical process e.g. how was the interpretation amended or enhanced at the 3rd and 4th stages? Can some examples be included in this table?

I would imagine that there were more than two main themes developed from the analysis, and if so, can these be mentioned along with some explanation that this paper focuses on two? It would be helpful to include a thematic map or list to show what the full range of other themes/sub-themes were to provide context, even if these are not the focus of this paper. In addition, why is the theme named 'listening and talking', whereas in the data and discussion it seems to be more specifically about 'listening and telling' rather than 'talking'?

The paper is enhanced by the fact that non-verbal 'video' data is included and incorporated into the findings, but the links between the 'text' data and 'visual' data are less prominent in the wider discussion and conclusions sections E.g. How did these non-verbal behaviours contribute and/or
exacerbate/ameliorate/contrast with the verbal communication, and how does this all tie in with the conclusions?

The paper does not discuss clearly how the 'video' e.g. visual aspects of data were incorporated into the analysis. The table describes 'coding' data, but not how this was achieved for non-text data. A brief summary of this should be included.

Limitations

The strengths and limitations section is clearly written and summarises most of the key issues. However, an additional limitation is the potential differences between those who did not consent to being videoed (and are therefore not part of the study) and those who were happy to be recorded. Can something along these lines be added?

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

No

**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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