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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and worthwhile piece of work. Volunteers to the interview process are important and should be valued. One way of doing this is to gain feedback from them and use it to improve future interviewing events. I like the framework that was used.

Before publication I believe that this article needs considerable editing and re-structuring. There is a great deal of repetition and in some cases, what is being repeated is not the same as previously, for example the list of reasons why people interview changes slightly each time it is documented.

The Background section is good and does not need much change. The Research Context is useful but some of the aspects given in the Methods should be in this section, for example the section headed ‘MMI stations’ is part of the context, it is not part of the research project. Similarly the first paragraph of the RESULTS. It is important to separate the conduct of the MMIs from the investigation of the interviewers' motivation, which is the objective of the research.

It is not clear what purpose is served by the reporting of the interviewer demographics. It would have been useful to know the demographics of the 40 people participating in the research project and how representative this group is of the wider group. I think demographics are often best shown in a table, so that it's all very clear, with all categories represented. It was designated as a convenience sample and that is fine, but a description of the sample would be helpful. Abbreviations such as 'admin' should be written in full.

More information is needed on the interviews conducted with the interviewers. In one section they are reported as 'Focus group results'. Were they individual interviews or focus groups? Whatever the format of the interviews they need to be explained in detail - this is the essence of the research. How long? who conducted the interviews/focus groups? structured? were they the same across sites?

I understand the value of verbatim quotations in qualitative research. However some of these are too long and should not include the 'ums' and 'ahs. As they stand these quotations are difficult to read and comprehend. Make sure the essence is there but not all the 'wordy bits', which just confuse.
The issue of written feedback suddenly appears in the Results. This sounds quite important in this context, so it should be in the Research Context section so we know that it exists.

**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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