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7th November 2014

Dear Editors,

Manuscript number: 1600357194132408  
Response to editorial reviewer comments

The authors would like to thank the editors for taking the time to review the revised manuscript and for suggesting further amendments which we have now incorporated in full. We provide a point-by-point outline of our revisions below.

With many thanks,

Yours sincerely,

Samantha Stressing and Alan Borthwick

Editorial reviewer comments.

1. Title: following the colon, change *Expert* to *expert* (i.e. avoid over capitalisation).  
Revisions incorporated as required.

2. Abstract, Methods: change *semi structured to *semi-structured* (this will be consistent with the rest of the manuscript).  
Revisions incorporated as required.

3. Abstract, Methods: change 3 and 4 to three and four.  
Revisions incorporated as required.

4. Abstract, Results, last sentence: change *up skilling* to *upskilling*? This change needs to be made throughout the manuscript.  
Revisions incorporated as required.
5. Replace the heading *Introduction* with *Background* and remove the heading *Background*, which you currently have after the first paragraph (in line with JFAR headings and heading hierarchy).

Revisions incorporated as required.

6. 3rd paragraph of the Introduction/Background, last sentence: change *allied health professions* to *AHPs* as previously defined? Please check the entire manuscript for this issue. In the same sentence, change *prioritization* to *prioritisation* (i.e. UK English to be consistent with the rest of the manuscript).

All revisions incorporated as required.

7. Methods: you need to abbreviate Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists to SCP the first time you use the term as you go on to use the abbreviation SCP later.

Revisions incorporated as required.

8. Methods, Participant recruitment: please provide the ethics committee project number from the university in brackets following the sentence indicating the study gained ethical approval.

Revisions incorporated as required (project number inserted).

9. Results: please remove over-capitalisation of the list of headings of the themes and the actual headings; 1. The impact of change, 2. Concerns about future provision, 3. Meeting the challenge.

Revisions incorporated as required.

10. 4th last line of page 8: *Masters of PhD?*, should this be *Masters or PhD?*.

Revisions incorporated as required (thank you, yes, it should be “Masters or PhD”).

11. Add a paragraph at the end of the Discussion highlighting the limitations of the study (e.g. sampling issues, etc.).

Revisions incorporated as required. We have added the following paragraph to highlight the limitations: “The findings in this study were necessarily constrained by certain limitations. Although key actors were recruited to the study, the sample size was still relatively small, given the range of speciality areas included. Face-to-face interviews, usually preferred for key actor interviews, were mainly conducted by focus group interview, in order to best utilise availability of participants. Finally, most participants were recruited from England, giving less opportunity for issues relating to the devolved administrations to be considered”.

12. Review the list of abbreviations: are they all used in the manuscript? I cannot find PIS for example.

Revisions incorporated as required. Thank you for drawing this to our attention. We have removed those abbreviations that do not appear in the text, including PIS, GP, FCA and ESP, and added NICE, which does appear in the text.

13. References: change references to correct JFAR format.

Revisions incorporated as required, to the BioMed Central format.