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Reviewer’s report:

The authors report on a survey among Swiss primary care group practices concerning the roles of non-medical health professionals. The topic is relevant and the manuscript widely coherent. I have some comments:

1. The background section is fairly extensive. I would recommend to consider a stronger focus on your research questions.

2. Could you empirically justify your definition of group practice? Why at least three physicians but not e.g. two or four?

3. Who was your main contact person in the group practices? Who was asked to fill in the questionnaire? Who actually filled in the questionnaire? Some answer may differ depending on the person who answered, e.g. head of the practice, subordinated doctor, other professionals.

4. Was there any (financial) incentive?

5. On page 7, you describe the translation of the questionnaire from German to French and Italian. However, it does not become clear how the basic questionnaire was developed. Could you please explain how you developed the items? Did you carry out a qualitative pilot study (e.g. expert interviews) to identify relevant issues? Were items adapted from other international questionnaires?

6. Page 8 line 41: It is not clear to me why in some group practices there was only one doctor, taking into account your definition of group practices (at least three doctors).

7. The conclusions partially consist of a repetition of information also provided in the background and the results. I would recommend to better work out was this study adds to the international literature. What are the major practical and political implications?

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.

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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