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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review your manuscript, which I recognise will have substantial practical value. I have some recommendations before publication.

Abstract
This needs some improvement as it currently creates a rationale and aim of your article but does not articulate your own contribution. There is a lot of space given to the background and very little information given in results or conclusion. For example, the first sentence of the abstract's conclusion was not convincing, saying your work fills a critical gap, but the reader does not know how. I suggest highlight some of the concepts and domains.

METHODS
Line 115 - please give the cash incentive amount
Line 116 - Please give details in the main part of the methods summarising how the semistructured interview guide was developed. This is too important to move into the appendix, given that this appears to have been an important part of your method.
Line 122 - The Thematic analysis and coding approach is not clear. You have stated that the initial codes were predetermined, suggesting a deductive element to the analysis, however in line 122 also refer to your approach as inductive TA. You have not given the reference for Bernard 2006 in your paper, therefore I was not able to understand your thematic analysis method.
Line 132 - I understand the themes have been conceptualised as actions, which is good, though suggest this be stated explicitly in methods that this is how you approached coding and the rationale for this rather than stating 'action themes'.

RESULTS
I suggest substantial cutting back of the illustrative quotes. They are very long, but there is also opportunity to decrease the numbers of quotes if you want to include them in the results as you have. Currently they make the results section difficult to read, particularly as in several places you let the quotes speak for themselves without describing the finding adequately. The writers could consider adding (shortened) illustrative quotes to Table 3 if they prefer to include all the quotes, so that they could report more effectively on their findings in the results without disturbing the flow of the results section.
Line 233 - I query this this theme of non-verbal contact by touch being part of the domain of respect and dignity, and the research team interpretation of the physician's discussion of physical examination.
The quote suggests to me a maxim of medical education that neglecting to do physical examinations of patients is a common mistake made by doctors which leads to incorrect diagnosis.

DISCUSSION
The discussion is short and could be deepened. In this manuscript there is substantial restating of your goals and methods and findings and no discussion in the light of the literature at all. Your argument that this is critical and useful work by the action list you have generated needs more support through an argument based in the literature.

Minor suggestions
P 5 line 87: I would not use the word emerges when referring to the paper as the paper reports on findings, it is a confusing use of the word in a qualitative study.
Line 113 - typo - missing 'in'

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.

Unable to assess

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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