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Reviewers report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The question is descriptive - it is not entirely clear to the international reader what the context within the respective health system is. The authors should describe the health system and the role of private providers of neuroimaging within it.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   This is outside my expertise. A specialist in qualitative data analysis should be consulted.

3. Are the data sound?
   See above

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

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

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   See above

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Not known

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No

9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes

To me this appears to be a moderately interesting opinion piece. It is not obvious how the 'evidence based conclusions' follow from the data by necessity. In fact the use of the term 'evidence based' in this context is confusing and should be avoided. Admittedly there is some evidence, but this evidence is not logically connected to the conclusions drawn by the authors.

"To this end, we conducted interviews with key stakeholders to bring rigorous, empirical evidence to the issue." This 'rigor' presumably refers to the fact that somebody actually asked a sample of the respective 'stake holders' rather than
assuming their opinions. However there is no analysis to make it possible to interpret voiced opinions in the context of any objective interests. Furthermore, the scientific validity of the opinions voiced has not been examined. This may only be possible on a case by case, or at least diagnosis by diagnosis level.
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