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Reviewer's report:

General
1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

As universal screening programs for newborns with hearing loss are being designed and implemented, not only in the United Kingdom, but also throughout the world, the information provided about how general practice physicians obtain information about new health initiatives is a significant contribution, not only in the UK but also world-wide. The questions, to my knowledge, have not been addressed previously. The questions are well-defined.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

The methods are appropriate and well-described and could be easily replicated in other countries where universal newborn hearing screening programs are being implemented. Because of the success rate of obtaining information from over 50% of the respondents, the types of questions and the length of the survey were appropriate and resulted in a good return rate.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

The data are sound. Because of length restrictions on the survey, the data were not able to be analyzed by demographic characteristics. However, the information provided seems to overwhelmingly indicate that the methods of information dissemination were not reaching the vast proportion of intended recipients. Additional methods of information dissemination are, therefore, vital if universal newborn hearing screening is to be a successful health initiative. Over sixty percent of the respondents indicated that they wanted more information.

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

The manuscript adheres to relevant standards for reporting and data deposition.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

The discussion and conclusions are well-balanced and adequately supported by the data.

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

The title and abstract accurately convey what has been found.

7. Is the writing acceptable?

The article is well-written. I recommend that the article be published as it is written. The information contributes to our current knowledge base.
In reference 2, the spelling of Yoshinago – should be changed to Yoshinaga

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)
None

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
None

What next?: Accept without revision

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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