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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an interesting paper that uses a new methodology to capture Netherlandish GP work hours and compare male to female results. The findings are consistent with those from a variety of other countries: that female practitioners work fewer hours than their male counterparts. The authors interestingly find that age curves are consistent across genders.

I have two issues with the paper. The first is the quality of the written English and the punctuation. The paper should be revised by a native English speaker with a good command of English grammar.

The second issue is around the childcare issue. There is a lot of speculation about childcare, but I do not see that the authors asked any specific questions about numbers or ages of kids at home nor of childcare responsibilities and their distribution. I'd therefore refocus on what is known from the study and try to eliminate most of the child-care speculation bit (other than perhaps to say findings are consistent with childcare as a driver)....but it could just be spoiled millennials who want more time to play video games.

Otherwise, interesting if not particularly novel findings.
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