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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
NONE

Minor Essential Revisions
Page 4 lines 103/104: Please add numbers and % for each - general comments are of no academic value to readers needing to interpret the findings of the study.

Table 1: What does "general health status of patients" refer to and is it necessary for the article as I do not see any discussion around the data?

Table 1: What does "number of patients in practice" mean or refer to? Is it usual for a GP practice to only have an average of 45 patients?

Figure 1: Will actual picture examples be used here?

Discretionary Revisions
Page 5 lines 108 to 113: The description of what teleconsultation exposure entailed is clearer but still highly complex. Details relating to roles as GP co-ordinators or actually presenting cases are no doubt unavailable but should not be ignored in future studies. Also why certain GP practises are part of the teleconsultation networks and other are not needs more in depth study - perhaps these were the ones who lived further away from specialists?

Page 11 lines 291/291: The analysis of referral patterns relative to interest in dermatology and involvement in teleconsultations involves limited numbers of GPs. There might be some trend suggesting interest in dermatology and involvement in teleconsultations are independent, it is doubtful that the differences are significant otherwise the authors would have given p values?
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
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