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Reviewer's report:

I appreciate the authors’ careful and thoughtful response to the reviews. And I appreciate the other reviewer.

I have only the most minor additional suggestions.

A global replace of “/” with “or” was done, thus there are instances where the second word of the pair now has an “or” prefix. Line 18, 48, 53, 221 (twice)

Line 50. I think that should be “Decision appropriateness” (as in line 54), not “Decisions appropriateness”.

Line 76. Change “GP’” to “GPs’”.

Line 83. Change “GPs” to “GPs’”.

Line 176. Drop the second “from”.

Line 177 remove the hyphen from the noun phrase “validity checking”.

Line 231 needs a paragraph break.

Line 253. Kostopoulou gets irate when you misspell her name.

Line 359. Space after the period?

Lines 381-382. This sentence is hard to parse. The trouble has to do with “more participants...” and figuring out what the comparison is.

Line 392 needs a paragraph mark.

Line 455. “...the validity of patient scenarios as a proxy method of GPs decision making.” GPs should be plural possessive. Is patient scenarios a method, a measure, a laboratory. Accepting “method”, I think it should be “a proxy method of studying GPs’ decision making.”

You nicely added periods for each of the notes in tables 1 and 2, but did not do so for the new table 4.
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