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Reviewer's report:

I have reviewed the paper again and the authors have responded well to the suggestions made by me, however there are still points that need to be addressed before publication in my view:

1) dietary advice has not been included in the title as stated by the authors in their revision letter.

2) The authors state that verbal consent has been obtained from the patients, that is surprising and there is also no mention of an Information Sheet given to participants, this is common practice, but not in France? Verbal consent is not sufficient in many countries.

3) The issue of validation has not been addressed sufficiently in my view, only partially, however this is important for robust data analysis. May I suggest to read some qual papers and see how other authors dealt with this issue, as I have mentioned some suggestions in my first review.

4) p.3/line 45: ...'can contribute to improving.... (improving what exactly?), do the authors mean treatment or something else, not clear to me.

5) p.4/line12: .....'who had been under treatment...' of what specifically, not clear.

6) The authors expanded how the interview guide was developed, mainly due to experiential knowledge of one of the authors, which is fine. However I was surprised that no reference was made to the literature, that commonly informs interview guides too. In addition the fact that the interviewer is knowledgeable about conducting interviews is not relevant to the question how the interview content was developed in my view.

7) The authors included some info re pilot work: however it is not clear what kind of formulation the authors refer to that has changed for the interview schedule, pl provide a specific example for the reader, so s/he can be confident that aspects of the interview guide has been changed to the 'better'.
8) data saturation: pl provide a definition (many readers do not know what it means in my experience) and relevant references.

9) the result section is much more alive with the relevant accounts and identifiers, thank you very much.

10) p.5/line58: 'patient showed an 'attraction'...', do the authors mean 'interest to'?

11) p.6/23: what are dietary landmarks, never heard of this expression, pl explain.

12) authors mentioned twice 'medical institution's in the manuscript, pl specify what these are.

13) can the authors pl revise all statements that include, patients felt', to assess what they expressed is actually a feeling, this phrase is commonly used in appropriately however, 'reported', 'stated', 'mentioned', 'alluded to' etc. may be more accurate for example p7/line 26.

14) p7/line 40: perhaps Doctor-patient relationship is more appropriate than 'caregiver' in the subtitle, as the latter is a generic word for many people, however I think the patients were talking about the doctor specifically?

15) Discussion section: low recruitment in General Practice is very common, the reasons stated in the paper seem to me speculative rather than facts, therefore may I suggest to add relevant references to substantiate this claim, pl? In addition p.8/line 20: the authors hinted that the average age of the GP is lower than specialists, this needs to be substantiated as well I do not follow the reason the authors stated in this sentence.

16) also provide relevant references how support group can make a difference to patients, I agree with the statement, but I think relevant references from long-term conditions would strengthen the argument.

17) The written English has improved a great deal from the previous version, however some aspects are still not clear, pl can the whole manuscript be double checked again. I did not highlight these specifically.

Hope the feedback is helpful.
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