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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this timely and well-written manuscript. The background section did an excellent job of framing the problem. Description of measurement and evaluation tools was clear and thorough. One point of clarification: it was unclear to me at points in the introduction and methods whether both the patients and the GP's watched the video, or only the GP's. It became clear as I read the results, but could benefit from being explicated earlier in the manuscript. I found the BCT coding and findings surrounding that coding to be particularly interesting; I feel the addition of that work strengthened this study. Although findings and discussion highlight the GP's concerns surrounding time and realism of the med review presented in the video, a more practical question arises in my mind: Having working closely with MD's in busy practice, I wonder if they would watch the video at all if not part of the study. That point may be added to the discussion if authors feel it is appropriate. Although GP evaluation of the video was positive, it was not overwhelmingly so. More discussion of how the intervention could be realistically strengthened would add to the manuscript.
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