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**Reviewer's report:**

General

The authors responded to most of my earlier remarks, but I still have some suggestions.

---

**Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)**

1. Appendix 1 about the concordance scores was not added to the article.
2. A key instrument is the instrument that measures E, P and C typologies. The instrument is referred to in the article as the psychometric instrument. I should say that all scales have certain psychometric characteristics, but there is no psychometric instrument. The authors used an instrument that measures three typologies. It helps if the instrument has a name, e.g. EPC-scales.
3. The problem of selective loss on the physicians has been addressed in the discussion. Their willingness has been reasoned, but we don't no anything about how it could have affected the data.
4. Discussion, 8th paragraph, last sentence is about the variation in guidelines adherence. The authors stated: "Greater variation in guidelines adherence between sites and between physicians would have been desirable, ... " I suppose the authors mean that in case of hypothesis testing it is desirable, but patients certainly wouldn't agree. This sentence has to be rephrased.

---

**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:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.