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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions: none

Discretionary revisions [DR] & Minor essential revisions [MER]

A) Title & Abstract:
1. I still think that the title can be more concise. [DR]
2. If you remove the “and” before “constantly” and put a “,” instead, than the four strategies are clear. [DR]
3. Again, not all the conclusions can be derived from the results presented in the result section of the abstract. The discussion is not adequately supported by the data. In general, the conclusion section present no new results, but place the result found (and described in the result section of the abstract) in a larger context. This was not the case in current abstract. [MER]

B) Method:
1. On page 6 and 7 the physicians’ characteristics are given. Should that not be better placed at the beginning of the results? I think it is more usual to begin the result section with the characteristics of the sample (physician and patient). [MER]

C) Results:
1. It is unusual to start a result section with a summary of the results found. At the beginning of the discussion part it is more usual (just as the author has done). [MER]

D) Tables & Figures: There are still a lot of tables and figures. As most information given in table 3 is also given in the result part, perhaps it could be omitted. [MER]

E) In general, I think the article has been improved, but it is still very long in length. Sometimes same sentences or ideas are repeated. Being more concise would benefit the article.
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