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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for asking me to review this interesting paper. I was not able to find a cover letter, which detailed the changes that were made and the previous reviewers comments.

I still think there needs to be more clarity in the methods section about how the participants were selected and included. It took me some time to work out the connection between the GP pop-up and the fact that these were then the patients that had been randomly selected. I think this needs to be clarified. Were the patients excluded from the survey before the patient questionnaire was sent or on receipt of the completed patient questionnaire?

In the description of the analysis, it is still not clear how the variables were selected for inclusion in the adjusted analysis. It say "....and each independent variable was followed by a multivariate model" which makes no sense. Usually with logistic regression models, that variables are tested in a univariate analysis and then those that were associated with the outcome of interest were included in the multivariate model. A p-value is usually set at say 0.1 and then those variables included in the multivariate model. It is not clear from the description what the authors have done here. It is also not clear how the authors adjusted for clustering by GP in the model.

The perception of waiting time is confusing, especially in relation to telephone consultations because presumably the consultation follows immediately from the triage by the GP. It makes sense for the clinic visit and the home visit options.

Are the methods appropriate and well described? 
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls? 
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown? 
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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