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1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes, clear and concise--and in the right location of the paper.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes.

3. Are the data sound?
No problems with data.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes except for one minor omission. Published search hedges for qualitative studies in Medline do exist. I think that the authors may have just missed them. Not a big deal as I think that the results would likely be identical if they had used these filters or not.


8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes.

Please make your review as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories:

• Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

CMAJ and BMJ are the correct titles for the journals instead of their previous Canadian Medical Association Journal and British Medical Journal.

I am not sure you need the abbreviations on GM and maybe not on health services and policy research.

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

Nothing

• Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Nothing. Well done and important paper.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest 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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