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Reviewer's report:

General
Thank you for giving me a chance to review the revision of the paper and the other reviewer's comments. This has not been my experience with other reviews and I appreciate BMC's policy of transparency. Thanks too to the authors for their revisions. I don't think the additional information changes my view of the merits of the study but it will help readers make an informed judgement.

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

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. It would be helpful if the authors state the response rate to the questionnaire E.g., on page 10, paragraph 1. Fifty-nine questionnaires were returned (response rate approximately 13%) and were categorized . . .)

2. In response #2 the authors state that the quantitative survey was carried out during the same time period as the qualitative survey. However in the paper (page 5, paragraph 1, last sentence) they state that they used the survey to quantitatively measure the relative importance of the previously identified motivating factors and barriers. This and the last sentence of the Methods section of the abstract suggest that Part B was carried out after Part A. It would be helpful if the authors clarified the sequence in which Part A and Part B were done.

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

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
Response # 6 – the authors state that you can't get meaningful answers to questions asked in an empty room in response to my comment about lack of data from those who did not attend rounds. I wonder if the authors made an attempt to recruit infrequent attenders by telephone or personal contact when they received no responses to the mailed invitation. If they did and there were still no volunteers, it might be helpful to include this in the paper to emphasize the difficulty of recruiting such subjects.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
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