

Author's Response to Editor's Revised Comments and Suggestions: Jan 4, 2016

Editor's Comments/Suggestions	Response
1. The word count is now very long at over 4,700 words. I accept that the nature of this study means that the word count will be on the long side, but you could reduce it by abbreviating your first section (the background), in particular	Thank you for allowing some additional length. I have now reduced the background description in the introduction significantly, and shortened several other areas as well.
2. Thank you for addressing some of the generalisations. However, you still do make some statements that appear to suggest that your findings are generalisable to all paramedics. For example, the very first sentence of the results section is "Paramedics know that in recommending referral to patients they are introducing an element of risk to their patients' lives". There are quite a few similar statements throughout the results and discussion. I think it's important to remove those statements and focus on emerging themes from the data in your sample (rather than generalising).	This observation is accepted and over 10 such generalisations have now been removed from the most recently submitted version.
3. Thank you for amending the conclusion and removing some discussion. On reading the revised version, I'm still not sure that your conclusion adequately summarises what this work has shown. I think the emphasis really ought to be on communicating the emerging themes from your work and the implications of this for the field. At present, the conclusions (a) seem to generalise and (b) seem slightly vague in that the association with the results section is not easy to appreciate.	The conclusion has been revised accordingly. It now focuses on the study's themes and includes implications.
4. One final thing that I think may present a barrier to effectively communicate your message is the use of the word "professionalism" throughout. This seems a little bit of a vague term and I'm really not sure that readers will appreciate what you mean by it or how it ties to the subject of the interviews. If it's possible to do so while remaining true to the work that you've done, I suggest amending the title to give extra clarity about the nature of this work and your objectives. I also suggest taking a close look at each use of the term "professionalism" in the manuscript and considering whether using alternative terminology will convey your message more effectively.	The word "professionalism" has been removed from the title so that it is more precise. "Professionalism" has also been removed from the article itself in its entirety. The article is now more focused on the substantive narrative of risk framing. A few contextual phrases remain and those have been changed to alternative terminology.