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Reviewer’s report:

My initial concern was the low response rate and this remains unchanged. The authors have however addressed the issue more thoroughly in their discussion.

Major Compulsory Revisions
The research question/null hypothesis still requires better definition: is this an audit of NICE guidelines; an audit of GPs’ awareness of ovarian cancer symptoms or an attempt to assess the impact of NICE guidelines on referral pathways. This must be clear and unequivocal.

Minor Revisions
Paragraph 2: sentence beginning 'There are few published studies....' The sentence is too long and the meaning obscured by having 2 separate statements linked by 'and' The authors should either replace 'and' with 'in addition' or begin a new sentence 'Ca125 is yet to be shown to function....'

Once this is addressed I think this article should be published as it is topical and relevant.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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