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Reviewer's report:

The paper has benefited from the revision. However, there are still some modifications necessary.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Whose Costs?

You clearly state that you focused on the doctors` perceptions of some managed care tools. However, based on your original questions (appendix 1) and your presentation it is not clear if the physicians interpreted the expression “control of health care costs” with reference to their own costs or to the whole society/health insurance.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Summary score

In your response to my comment concerning “sensitivity analysis for weightings” you point out the “important limitation” that probably each doctor has different weights. It would be a good idea to include this argument in your running text, because this is a good explanation for using mean scores. You might assume that the different weights cancel each other. This is more scientific in comparison to your phrase “to simplify the presentation of results”.

2. Your policy implications are rather vague.

Discretionary Revisions

1. The first section of the introduction is much too long

2. You call “Harold Luft” an “expert”. Using this term in studies like this is quite
unusual
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