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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)

Table 2 is not very clear. could they make the title or explain more clearly in the text of the results section what it means?

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

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

As requested, the authors have added mean differences and confidence intervals for the comparisons of list size, in three separate paragraphs on pages 6, 7 and *. but I think these could be expressed in an easier and more succinct way. I've rephrased their first comparison below, but the same approach could apply to the other similar paragraphs:

'Practices that limited the time allowed for patients to make advanced appointment bookings had larger list sizes (mean 6943, SD 2706) than those which did not limit advanced bookings (mean 3641, SD 2213), mean difference xx to xx, p<0.001.'

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

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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