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Reviewer's report:
Please see the corresponding areas in the attached Manuscript, with the annotated areas highlighted in yellow.

1. Grammatical error (Line 71): "perceive", not "perceived".

2. Line 124:
This point was listed among the study aims, but I am not sure the results addressed it well. I am not convinced that this research question was answered by this research, as it was not very clear to me what they think of the MyHospitals Website. A few did not know about it from the report, but what was the overall conclusion on this?

3. Lines 133 to 136:
This area is confusing. Was the invitation sent to all 159 members of the VicRen, or just the 131 GPs? Also, how many GPs were reached in the 294 GP Teaching Practices? Finally, do we believe that 40 out of the entire 159 or 131 (+294) GPs accepted to be part of the study, or did the authors trim down from whatever number that accepted? Basically, how many GPs were reached in total, and how many accepted to be part of the study? It might help to make the numbers explicit for easier understanding. It might also help to add how many of the 40 respondents were Senior GPs, and how many were Junior GPs, since their varying experiences might have implications as to their experiences with the PPR. What defines a senior and a junior GP? Is it the number of years of experience, or is it based on possessing the College Fellowship? Please kindly make these explicit.
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