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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper reporting a qualitative study nested inside a larger study. The background and aims are clear. It is concisely written but would benefit from some clarification and expansion of the methods section to bring the reporting in line with the coreq standard.

* The methods section does not specify how practices were to identify and recruit patients and, although it is mentioned in the discussion as being consecutive, this should be in the recruitment section.

* From the discussion it appears that this study was time limited. The method does not mention a proposed sample size or comment on data saturation. Thus it is difficult to know if the achieved sample size was adequate.

* The paper does not mention who did the coding and analysis. Although this is in the acknowledgements, it should really be in the text.

* There is no detail in relation to data handling, coding or the coding tree. It is not clear if any software was used to record the analysis and what steps were taken to ensure the rigour of the analysis beyond discussion. It is not clear who was involved in the discussion. There is no description of divergent cases or minor themes.

I think this paper requires substantial revision but this should be easy to achieve and it will make a valuable contribution to the literature.
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.

Unable to assess

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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