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Reviewer's report:

The article is very interesting and offers an insight in the implementation process of the accreditation standards at the primary care level. The researchers conducted a lot of interviews and got information on obstacles and incentives that influenced the process. Anyway, the article needs a revision before being published.

BACKGROUND

METHODS

Line 74-126: the section does not describe the methods but it describes Danish health system and circumstances regarding accreditation. It could be a part of background section. I am interested in why authors decided to put it into Methods section?

Line 128: The subtitle is Qualitative interviews but in this section authors do not describe only the qualitative interviews (as the title is suggesting) but also location/settings.

Line 169-176: this part does not describe the method; it's a discussion part

I suggest the next topics to be clearly described:

the aim, design and setting of the study

the characteristics of participants

a clear description of all processes, interventions and comparisons

type of analysis used.
RESULTS

Results are presented well. A Table which would present/summarise all main themes, (subthemes) and codes (if possible) that have been identified during analysis could be added; or to insert somewhere the main coding-tree.

Line 182: "At the beginning of the preparation process, almost all practices had experienced some degree of uncertainty concerning their understanding of the accreditation standards."

.."almost all practices" means that you made a quantification of the results? How can you explain that statement

Line 479: … seem to imply that that the standards… (repeated word)

DISCUSSION:

The discussion on methods is missing. Why such sampling? Why two interviews with the same practice (before and after accreditation process) were conducted?

General comment: there are many statements that do not discuss results but repeat them. It is necessary to discuss about the findings (why?) because they are very important.

Limitation:

I presume that the purposive sample was used. It means that you got relevant information from participants who knew the problem. With the saturation of data, you can conclude that no new idea can arise. Did you achieve the saturation of data? How did you validate the appropriateness of the study and the reliability of the research?

Why do you think the results are limited? Do you think other practices would have different view or attitudes?
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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