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Reviewer’s report:

General

This is a well written report of a comprehensive piece of research which has been conducted and analysed with care and attention to detail.

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

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

None

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

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

None

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The authors may wish to discuss the possibility of comparative effects in the ratings. Since most respondents will have experience of more than one PPO, their rating of an organisation may be influenced by their experience of the others. The current analytical strategy does not account for this. Whilst such an analysis would be complex it may worth adding to the discussion.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

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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