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Reviewer's report:

General
The manuscript has mostly had minor revisions. As a result, the overall comment that the study would gain from more explanation in order to improve the lessons learned still applies.

Major Compulsory Revisions
Concerning the first review, I will readdress a few comments that fit in the general comment. In the case of the background the added value is still not clear, even though the authors have deleted the word quality. In addition, the hypotheses still tend to fall out of place and are better described as a cluster of preliminary findings or tentative hypotheses at best. In the results section I questioned the description of some comparisons, unless they have a theoretical basis or major policy implications. In a number of cases the authors have now removed nonsignificant comparisons (e.g. in the section on 'further education'), without clear replacements. Though understandable, I would however argue that such findings can indeed still be interesting, as long as their relevance is explained, either based on similar findings from other studies or from a general line of thought. For the same purpose I also think the article can gain from a better description of the possible relevance of the type of health care system in order to understand its applicability to other national contexts.

At the same time, the study has been done correctly and does pose valuable policy implications, amongst others by raising awareness for the different viewpoints of GPs and specialists and by pointing to a strong support for a shared digital medical record. Although I would like to encourage the authors to make a few last modifications, I therefore see the added value of publication of this study to an international audience.

Minor Essential Revisions

Discretionary Revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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