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Reviewer’s report:

Overall I feel the quality of the paper has greatly improved. There are still a couple of points that I think should be addressed prior to publication. The purpose of the study is much clearer and the conclusions are now justified.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Satisfactory, but suggest further editing to the 2nd paragraph 1st sentence to state there was a 20 day pilot period with x GPs... rather than “a short pilot period”. There could also be further clarification of exactly how many GPs collected the data in each arm of the study, and whether they were the same doctors throughout. The second last sentence of para 3 of the methods is ambiguous as it could mean that two GPs were present timing the calls for each measurement – suggest further clarification there. In last para (statistical methods) I am unsure of what the authors meant by “transferred to SPSS for data cleaning purposes…”.

3. Are the data sound?
   The authors have added discussion of limitations – I would suggest that they add some information to address the point made in my previous review that there was no reliability checking of the GP measurements. There could be some description of this limitation in the paper’s discussion. The author’s response to this point (item 8 in previous review) that “both GPs were trained and standardize the way in which measurements were done” has not been added to the paper that I can see, and it could improve the methods section if there was a description of this point.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes – plus comments above
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes – plus comments above

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Still some grammar problems throughout –
eg Methods para 1: “All patients had the ability to read and write as they were requested to fill and administrative format before consultation.”

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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