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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for asking me to review this article.

I feel that the revised paper is much improved and the authors have taken account of the reviewers’ comments. I do feel that the qualitative data is presented in a fairly descriptive way, but it does illustrate data from the survey.

Was ethical approval needed for the study? Could the authors clarify this, and add to paper.

I would be grateful if the authors could state clearly how many practices this study was conducted in; and also comment on the effect of giving the health care professionals a gift voucher for participation.

The authors need to clarify whether the data in 1a is from the same, or different, GP.

on page 12, the authors state 'The PaTz groups performed remarkably well.' - on what do they base this statement?

on page 13 - the sub-heading 'Psychological characteristics of participants' is not clear to me (and doesn't seem to relate to the content of the paragraph which follows. similarly, the sub-heading on page 14 'Cognitive maps' does not make sense to me and needs clarifying and explaining.

The authors state that 'This reinvention of cooperation leads to better continuity of care' - but they have not demonstrated this. This phrase needs editing.

The conclusions on page 15 needs reworking - it is very odd to end a paper with participant data.
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