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Reviewer's report:

General
The authors have done a fine job of responding to previous concerns raised. I now have a more complete understanding of the context of this work and its implications.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
(1) The authors have improved the explanation of the questions that were used in the survey on pages 4/5. However, as with most of us who try to describe the questions we use, the itemization of them becomes difficult or confusing to read. I had originally suggested use of a table for this, but now think that one of the strengths of this journal (no length restriction on articles) could be used to simply include an appendix that is the questionnaire used.
(2) P8, Para 2: the last two sentences on how qualitative data was handled needs further elaboration. It may be unclear for those not doing qualitative work.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
(1) P5, para 2: I suggest saying: "systematic randomization choosing the name of every 3rd family doctor from an N=715 yielded 236 potential respondents". Incidentally, what did that involve: every 3rd doctor by alphabetical order? by year of licencing? by postal code? This is important to state because of potential biases that derive from randomization.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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