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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Not sure - key details are missing from the manuscript

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This multi-methods study examined GPs' and parents' perceptions regarding antibiotic prescribing for RTIs in young children. It described disparate views between GPs and parents and the need for better communication between both groups. The study clearly outlines the issues connected with GPs perceptions and patients views. It is fairly well written and the conclusions are sound.
REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Overall, the paper is well written, the findings are clear with the conclusions sound. There are two fundamental issues with the manuscript: (1) Line 110-115 The methods could not be adequately assessed as there was insufficient details in the manuscript and the reference that was cited was redacted. (2) Line 80-82: the sentence is very long. (3) Lines 212-214 The comment doesn't seem to be saying what the authors have explained. It seems to me that they're saying that it takes longer to explain the reason why people don't need antibiotic and how to self manage. Hence in the interest of time they prefer to give a script to stop parents from nagging. Line 292 rephrase to read '...GPs interpreted parents' attitude as wanting an antibiotic...' Line 338 should 'parents' be 'patients'? Line 347: How could the lack of male representation have biased the results? Line 373: The sentence is a bit fragmented. need rephrasing.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The recruitment and sampling technique must be described in detail as sufficient information has not been provided in this paper to allow adequate assessment of the methods, since the reference for the methods was redacted.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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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