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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, clear

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes, but the structure can be better by use headings: design population, variables etc. I don't understand why you don't use written case reports of the GP on call or an combination of written and adding telephone interview The first and the last method gives less recall bias and more reliable data. Please explain.

Patient give informed consent. Which percentage? And when the patient died?

3. Are the data sound? Yes, clear and well written

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? In general yes. I miss information of the weak aspects: recall bias. When I am on call I don't remember me exact the specific aspects as ECG, laboratory test, NACA and initial diagnosis. I have contact with 10 or more patients look alike. It is difficult to remember and discriminate between them. Furthermore I miss an advise for further research: Do GP's their work safe ( % missed diagnoses and % overdiagnoses) are there and what is the real outcome of the tests especially ECG.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Should better be done

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable? Well written

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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