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Reviewer’s report:

General
I am happy with the detailed and considered revisions and comments made by the authors. I would still prefer the discussion to include reference to other studies, not just the most up to date systematic review and while I was aware that the North Tyneside experience may well be exceptional, I still felt it was worth referring to and comparing results achieved in a similar health care setting. I was interested to note that the other reviewer also suggested expanding the discussion to include other published work. However, I can accept the authors viewpoint on this. I do not have the expertise to comment on the statistical revisions. I have only one discretionary revision to suggest.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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)
In relation to Reviewer 1: reviewers comments 3: There is an inconsistency in the authors stating that there was nor formal shared care in the PCTs involved and then adding a sentence to the paper stating that "approximately 20% of patients received shared care". I think it would be less confusing to state that approximately 20% of patients received both GP and specialist care though there was no formal shared care scheme in operation on the regions studied.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.