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Reviewer's report:

1. The "Abstract" is a bit too long - in all, much more than 300 words.

2. The "Abstract" contains a statement to the effect that "gut feeling" is associated with "increased likelihood" of "developing" SBI. It might be better to state that "gut feeling" is associated with a "higher likelihood" of "having" SBI.

3. It is preferable not to start sentences with Arabic numerals - see page 7, line 49.

4. Table 2: Identifying "True Positives" etc raises some concern. According to the authors, "Sense of reassurance in case of absent SBI was considered as true positive". As long as this understanding is stated as a footnote to the table, there need not be any problems. However, in the opinion of the reviewer, it should be considered "True Negative" instead. And here is the logic:

   When there is a sense of reassurance, the doctor is saying "I do not think there is SB!". If it turns out there is no SBI, then the "test" is truly negative. If on the other hand, it turns out there is really SBI, the doctor's sense of reassurance has been wrongly placed and the "test" is falsely negative.

5. The use of the term "this study" can sometimes lead to confusion. For example, within the last three lines of page 12 and the first two lines of page 13, that expression was used twice in reference to two separate studies - a reference study and the study under review. It is probably better to find alternative terms altogether.

6. Do the authors agree that "gut feeling" of respondent doctors was heavily driven by "red flag" signs? In other word, the study indirectly tested the usefulness of "red flag" signs in identifying SBI?

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:

Acceptable
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