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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the article "Medical overuse and quaternary prevention in primary care - A qualitative study with general practitioners". The article deals with an important issue in medical care, that is, overmedicalization. I have included more detailed comments on the manuscript and attached it.

My major concern with the article is that you say you have used grounded theory. Grounded theory is an inductive research approach (and not a theoretical framework). The approach is in essence inductive, and the purpose is to build theory.

While I thought your results were interesting, I did not think them inductive. Your aims are to gain "a deeper understanding of the definitions of medical overuse, its scope and its drivers, as well as quaternary prevention strategies from the GPs' point of view". Your results seem driven by this aim, and in fact these aims are the major themes that you have listed in the results section. While it is possible that these are in fact the important themes that emerge from the data, it is unlikely that they are exactly the same as your data. Therefore, I suspect that this has been a rather deductive approach, instead of "letting the data speak".

My other concern is that the aim of grounded theory is to build theory. I do not think that your analysis in this article has done that. The results are very descriptive, and represent to my mind something that could be gained from content analysis. There needs to be another, higher level of analysis conducted in order to build a theory of medical overuse. That could also be represented by a figure.

In conclusion, then, while I find this paper important and well written, I feel there is considerable work to be done to make it meet the criteria for a grounded theory paper.

I hope this assists you in reworking the paper!
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal