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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
It is not clear if the letters written concerned newly referred patients or those attending follow up appointments.
Since consultants knew which patients were participating in the study, were the GP letters relating to these patients different from usual?
I believe it would be helpful to state what was the ‘structure of letters written to GPs, since there is great variability in this aspect of consultant letters in my experience.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
You asked patients to circle words which were 'misunderstood'. It seems they highlighted words they did not understand and also 'errors' in the letters. Is the word 'misunderstood' appropriate in this context?

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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