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Reviewer’s report:

Overall I liked the article and found it easy to read. The arguments flowed well and the conclusions drawn were logical.

1. Was the question clearly stated and well defined
   The question was not very clearly stated. It came in the last paragraph at the end of page 2. The authors did measure effectiveness and utility of the service and the level of concordance between intention and consultations which were of interest but not referred to in the aims.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   The methods were appropriate and well described for the range of things being evaluated.

3. Are the data sound?
   The data are sound being simple descriptive stats.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   The manuscript does adhere to the relevant standards. The tables are clear and well labeled.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   The discussion and conclusions have generalized a bit too readily and these conclusions are not in my opinion based on the findings. The authors have not been clear that the findings can really only discuss the GPs use of the cardiology service as the other types of specialist service were used by so few GPs and so infrequently.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   The limitations section does state an obvious limitation of the study.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The title only really describes that an evaluation was conducted and gives no clue of the findings.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
The writing is clear and well structured. Can the authors please remove the word globally throughout as it is confusing in this context.

I recommend that the article is suitable for Publication with minor revisions. Please reconsider the title. Make the aims of the study clearer and put them in an introduction. Make the conclusions and discussion more about the cardiology service for which the authors have the data rather than the other services as these were rarely used by the GPs.
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