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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. This may be a country specific matter, but certainly in Australia any research involving humans (whether GP or patient) is required to have ethical permission. If this is not the case in The Netherlands and Belgium, it is probably worth stating it.

Minor Essential Revisions
2. I would like more information on the rationale for accepting or rejecting statements. Was the decision based on a combination of ranking and comments? This should be explained in more detail.

3. The authors make a really important point when they state that the "sense of reassurance" is based on a GP's ability to give a clear diagnosis, and is not necessarily associated with a favourable diagnosis for the patient. I would like a bit more discussion about this.

Minor discretionary revisions
4. Statement 1 was rejected after the first round, presumably without any changes to the wording. if this is the case, the wording should be the same in Text box 1 and 3.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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