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Reviewer's report:

The study titled "Pharmacists in general practice: a qualitative interview case study of stakeholders' experiences in a West London GP Federation" is well-written and interesting. However, the authors need to answer the following questions prior to further consideration for publication.

1. Can the authors clarify why the pharmacy team members a part of the stakeholders for this particular study? Given some of the questions asked (such as "Tell me about your experiences of having a pharmacists working in this GP surgery?"), I am not sure about the relevance of pharmacy team members as stakeholders.

2. Did the authors use Grounded Theory to generate and saturate the themes?

3. The Results section is too long. The authors need to shorten it.

4. Given the audience for this journal is most likely going to be from an international setting, the authors should consider using a different term than "GP surgeries" (e.g. - office).

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.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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