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Reviewer's report:

The authors report on a pilot study for exploring patient acceptance and perceived utility of automatically generated prevention summary and reminder sheets provided to patients immediately before consultations with their general practitioners in Australia. The paper focuses on an interesting area of research that aims to develop an intervention to increase the performance of preventive services in general practice.

The Title needs to be reflected the study more, for instance, in which health services? In your case, it should be in general practice.

The Abstract did not accurately convey what has been found. The qualitative results should be summarised and presented given they were important results from your study. The method needs to be explained a bit more, for example, the number of patients, GPs, settings and the study period.

The Body

Please check your formatting (subtitle bold and unbold on page 5, 12) and track change errors (on page 9, 12, 13, 14), and other errors (on page 5 line 3).

The Background presented interesting results from previous studies and discussed the HBM and PMT, but the conceptual framework of this study is weak and could be more clearly defined. Generally, the authors have presented the study objective in the background, however, the research aim (broadly) was not clearly stated.

Although the Methods were detailed described, I have problems with the order of the method section. Setting should come first, and Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be included in Recruitment section. Development of the intervention should be included in Intervention section. Ethics approval should come last. The data analysis of quantitative method was missing, which needs to be discussed even though just a descriptive statistical method. It is unclear that how many GPs in Adelaide and Melbourne who participate in this study and how to select the GP, which need to be addressed. I have a problem to locate the interview questions by telephone after consultation until I read the figures (2-4) in the results section. It would be clear for reader to provide details of your interview questionnaire in your data collection section.
The Results presented both quantitative and qualitative data. Figures (2-4) need to be named and numbered that the text referred to, the same as Figure 1 as well. Please check your format for this section (you have two results in the subtitle on page 8). For your qualitative results, I wonder if you can present a combined analysis results using quantitative way to summarise your qualitative results. For example, how many patients agree the information sheets enhance patient knowledge and other themes as well? Are there majority or some or minority? This is a suggestion.

In the Discussion and Conclusions, it is good that the authors discuss some limitations from their study. I have no information about your GP data. I couldn’t comment on if the data are fine (need information from method section). The research implications need to be discussed in the Conclusions.

I consider this paper needs a major compulsory revision before it can be considered for publication.

**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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