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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)

Abstract: Methods section: the number of surveys mailed to 'all GP/FPs' should be stated to provide clarity.

Background: it is important that all inappropriate apostrophies are removed as they alter the meaning of the sentence.

Methods: the modified Dillman method has not been addressed as requested. In other words, Explain the Dillman method. Contextualise the modification, giving reasons.

Results: contain several two-sentence paragraphs which were commented upon in the first review. There are even more in this revised submission. Too many two sentence paragraphs breaks concentration and disrupts the flow of reading, producing a disjointed read of the work. The paragraph commencing 'A comparison....performing the procedure' is unclear mainly due to the statistics not corresponding to the ones in the Table. Furthermore the reader is unable to satisfy themself as to the comparison of the figures as a comparative Table is not offered.

Discussion: 7.3% is mentioned in the text whereas it is 7.8% in the Table. Throughout this section it was dificult to follow the argument as the statistics in the text is not in the Table, eg 34.2% of physicians; 3.8-17.8% of GP/FPs. There is no Table citing the comparison of physicians worjing in FHNS to those in other settings, consequently it is not easy to follow the arguments made.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No
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