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Reviewer's report:
This paper reports qualitative study which has been well described by the authors. However there are a few areas which do need a little more explanation or reflection before publication, but this should not be difficult.

The description of the methodology is a bit misleading, particularly in the abstract. The method used to answer the question asked in this paper was qualitative analysis of focus group and interview data, the participatory action research project was the context in which the data was gathered - no details of that project are reported.

There should also be some reflection on the possible impact of the action research project on the findings of this study, particularly as the focus groups were repeated - was there any change?

The authors note that the study was limited to 4 practices due to resources which is not a problem but, because it is a small number, it is really important for the reader to understand the criteria the researchers used to designate them as carrying out 'best practice'. If these criteria were formal, they should be listed. If they were informal there should be some reflection on them.

The paper needs proof reading to ensure that all abbreviations are defined and that a few non English words such as de are translated.
The phrase 'short lines' appears several times. I think this is a direct translation but is not an idiom generally used in English. I think I know what it means, but a word of explanation would be helpful.

**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.
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:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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