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Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. I found it well written however I would have liked a greater attention to explaining the types of "EO" at the start. I understood more clearly with the tables at the end describing the types of EO in the studies. It is clearly very broad definition of interventions. Perhaps some are better than others which will make the study evaluation of all types lumped together difficult to draw conclusions on the most successful.

My main concern with the paper, and perhaps I have misunderstood, is that there appear to be three interviews only. This confuses the flow of the paper.

Qualitative data is always valuable, but I do not think we can state that the data is saturated.

to include the literature review with the qualitative data is a great idea, but it seems to me that the latter needs more attention, and could be an article on it's own.

Ideally, to have GPs interviewed about their experience of the "EO"process in addition to more of the "EO" presenters,
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