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Reviewer's report:

1 Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?  
The questions posed are not new but well defined and relevant in a health care climate that emphasizes efficiency and cost effectiveness reforms in primary health care.

2 Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? The methods are appropriate but insufficient details are provided to replicate the work. For example:  
no details are offered about the size of the sample and questions asked;  
no information is provided about the modification of the Dilman method;  
how was the 30% of clinical time calculated? If the physicians calculated this percentage themselves, how was parity ensured?  
the paragraph relating to questions in multiple-choice format is unclear as uncertainty surrounds whether outcome measures relate to the questions in multiple choice format; the figures in the text differ from those in Table 1: 58.3% and 75.7% in text compared to 51.7% and 75.6% in Table; a similar situation for 40.9% and 58.3%.

3 Are the data sound and well controlled?  
See comments in 2.

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?  
Some lack of clarity in the discussion, for example: "Likewise, lower percentages of GP/FPs felt confident with their skill in these procedures."  
The reference relating to "48% of physicians had received training in endometrial biopsy....." is questionable.  
The percentages in the paragraph commencing " Referral of minor surgical procedures.....made use of this alternative" do not relate to those in the Table.  
It is unreasonable to suggest that the study can be extrapolated to other urban settings as no information about the study setting was offered. Urban settings are not homologous.

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

7 Is the writing acceptable?  
Yes.

The referencing style is inconsistent.  
Avoid 2-sentence paragraphs
The paper would benefit from proof reading.

The paper requires minor essential revisions.

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No
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