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Reviewer’s report:

General

This is a very interesting and well written paper. It gives insight in preferences of GPs for collaboration models with medical specialists.

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

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

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

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

1) Unfortunately, this paper describes only one side of the story. For collaboration it takes at least two parties. The paper presents the preferences of only one; the GPs. To make (new) collaboration models successful also those of medical specialists should be known. The authors should emphasise that to develop new collaboration models more information is needed than currently presented. Please also indicate what kind of information.

2) In the discussion, I would like the authors to focus more on the relevance of their findings. What do these results actually mean for health policy makers? Provide more practical directions to how these results must be used in practice. Simply stating that one should consider these findings when setting up new initiatives is not enough. What kind of model suits these preferences the best?

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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