Reviewer's report

Title: Problems and needs for improving primary care of osteoarthritis patients: the views of patients, general practitioners and practice nurses.

Version: 2  Date: 2 January 2006

Reviewer: Peter R Croft

Reviewer's report:

General

Although the changes made by the authors have not been highlighted, the paper as a whole now reads fine to me and the authors seem to have addressed and improved the style and presentation of what is certainly a very interesting and useful study.

The only point that perhaps has not been addressed in full was the point about having a clear conceptual basis for the condition of "osteoarthritis", but I was probably being too demanding here in my original review, and the paper certainly now makes its main points clearly. Perhaps the one thing that could be tidied up is the lapse into the use of the word "arthritis" later in the paper - I think it would be better to stick firmly to "osteoarthritis" throughout since (whatever it is!) this is clearly the topic of the paper and of the interviews.

The grammar and language of the abstract and introduction could be tightened up a little more - the rest of the paper reads well.

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

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)

See above:
"osteoarthritis" for "arthritis"
check language and grammar of the abstract and introduction

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

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: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests