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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting and well written paper which explores GPs (and other staff) views about the use of computer based prompts as an intervention to reduce antibiotic prescribing.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Due to the voluntary nature of the process evaluation only 24 of the GPs/staff participated in the interviews. Were they representative of the full sample? Did the authors assess data saturation? I also think it should be clearer (it is in figure 1 but not in the main text) that all interviews were with intervention GPs.

2. Were the interviews conducted by someone who had been involved in the trial or someone who was associated with the trial as part of the process evaluation team? I am wondering if the interviewer had a vested interest or the GPs might have been reluctant to criticise the intervention to someone who had been involved in setting up the intervention and trial. Some reflection on this would be good.

3. From reading the text I am not sure how long the intervention had run before the interviews and questionnaire were administered. Was it still running at the time of the evaluation or what was the gap between the intervention ending and the process evaluation? This is a bit clearer from figure 1 but I would have liked to have seen this in the text.

4. For a process evaluation I would have liked to have seen some data on fidelity (how the intervention was actually used rather than how GPs say they used it). The authors may not have collected data on this, but some reference needs to be made to this limitation.

5. The reference to 'behaviour change theory' (background 4th paragraph) should be referenced.

6. I would say that the authors are perhaps slightly 'over-egging' the fact that the GPs find the intervention acceptable in the abstract and maybe at times in the discussion. There were certainly some less positive views and these should be represented too.
Discretionary Revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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