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Reviewer’s report:

This is an important study, that uses comprehensive and purposeful qualitative methodologies to reflect on the use of SoMe by clinicians as a patient facing tool. General points:

N is small, as is often the case in qualitative methodologies. I would have like further analysis of the completeness of the study in terms of saturation or similar.

Specific points:

Page 4 line 41: in general, it would be useful to index the year of any studies cited described in the body of the text. This is particularly important in the rapidly evolving world of technology.

Page 7, recruitment: It would have been interesting to know how many of those approached declined to participate further in the study, and the procedure for exclusion could be further clarified.

Page 7, line 38: Could the team clarify whether or not an audio recording was made, and if not, how the interviewer managed to transcribe verbatim accurately.

Page 8, line 9: I wonder what the relevance of the demography might be to the study. Is it included to demonstrate the representative nature of the participants or to draw some conclusions regarding the association of the qualitative findings to gender, ethnicity etc?

Page 14 line 12: I think the term Medicaid is probably understood world over, but just in case it isnt, I would advocate interpreting this term for the readership outside of the jurisdiction. In addition, to draw a conclusion regarding the reaction of one type of physician practice over another might require some statistical analysis. I wonder if this section could be reconsidered in that light.

Page 20: Conclusions: I wonder if the term lone ranger might be misinterpreted somewhat. To be clear, do the doctors who identify with lone ranger type practice in this domain actually see that as a negative point of view or a positive sign of robusticity

I would like to see further comment on the applicability of the findings, or not, to the broader community of physician early adopters.
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:
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