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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Was agreement between patient and referring regarding the goal of the consultation (consultation only vs. brief treatment vs. transfer) related to patients' satisfaction with the consultation process? Similarly - was agreement between referring and consulting physicians regarding goal of the consultation related to the referring physician’s satisfaction?

Are any more data available regarding the group of patients who did not arrive for consultation. If so these should be presented. If not, this should be mentioned in the discussion.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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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