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Reviewer's report:

I like this paper and believe that the response and revisions following prior reviews are appropriate. I should note, however, that I am not well versed in methodologic analysis as such, but I have reviewed a lot of similar papers and can also comment from the perspective of a practicing "GP"...actually an American general internist.

The paper is attractive in two ways:

1) the basic finding is somewhat counter-intuitive, at least I find it that way...therefore it should stimulate considerable interest.

2) perhaps more importantly, the methodology is very nicely laid out and serves as a fine model for other circumstances. For example, the results might change if the GP has an assistant do the photography, or the patient takes his own picture, or the picture is sent to a dermatologist's cell phone while the patient is waiting for a few minutes after seeing the GP, etc. In many settings the process will differ, but the basic technique for analysis will be applicable. Indeed, such analyses may prove useful for "quality improvement," or "process improvement" as clinicians and patients find ways to make the process more efficient...

I don't think the paper needs so many tables/graphs. The text spells out the results well, and there's no need for redundancy. The English is remarkably good for someone who is not native English speaking...but it could be a bit better if someone is close at hand to help with "copyediting."

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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