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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the revision of the manuscripts. I have only a few comments to make.

Major Essential Revisions

1. If the dependent variable of the regression analysis is the priority rating ranging from 1 (highest priority) to 10 (lowest priority) then the beta coefficients were not interpreted correctly. Significant positive beta coefficients should mean that higher scores are related to higher priority ratings (i.e. lower priorities!). This would be contradictory to expectations and the interpretations of the authors. Please clarify.

Minor Essential Revisions

2. In the results section you write: “GPs were most influenced by cost-effectiveness” Issues of “influence” should be restricted to the discussion section and, there also, it should be argued for, within the results section you can merely state associations between variables.

3. In the discussion you write. “Possibly the GPs in our study realise that patient benefit is a subset of cost-effectiveness.” From a theoretical point of view patient benefit and cost-effectiveness should be related positively. However, note that test for multicollinearity of predictors in the regression analysis was negative, implying no association. This strongly suggests that patient benefit and cost-effectiveness were seen as something distinct. This is actually an argument for a “misunderstanding” of the concept of cost-effectiveness, maybe it has been mixed up with costs per se. This should be part of your limitations section.
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