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Reviewer’s report:

General
1. The paper needs professional English editing.

2. It also needs editing to get it into the format of a scientific article, to organize the material. For example the Discussion section now starts with Principal findings, followed by Strengths, Weaknesses, Discussion of methods and Discussion of findings. The principal findings from this section can be summarized at the end of the methods section. Start Discussion section with the discussion of results, and move study limitations to the end of the article.

3. (Policy and Practice) Implications section needs better clarity in terms of the situations and purposes for which the findings of this study can be used. Title may also be revised to "Policy and Practice Implications" for better clarity of what the paragraph represents.

4. In the legend for the tables, the last sentence could be modified to "Adjusted PRs show associations of GPs' age, gender....."

5. In the textbox, the term single-handed practice can be changed to "solo practice" the normal term used.

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)

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: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes
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