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Reviewer's report:

By Berendsen AJ, Kuiken A, Benneker W, Meyboom-de Jong B, Voorn T, Schuling J.

I thank the authors for having taken the effort considering the reviewer’s comments and suggestions. In my opinion, the authors have answered my points quite well.

I have 1 minor essential revision: Table 4: Is the p value for the comparison on feedback correct? It seems to me that the difference should not be significant.

I have 2 discretionary revisions: Methods, page 4, last paragraph, starting with “subgroup analysis was performed...”. I would add “within the group of GPs and specialists respectively”

Discussion, page 6, first paragraph, starting with “Little differences were found”. This paragraph is not at the right place in my opinion. I would integrate the items mentioned here in the corresponding subheadings further in the discussion part.

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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