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Reviewer's report:

General
While this article addresses an important topic, it is not especially careful and thorough in doing so. Further, there is a rather extensive literature on the general topic of adherence to treatment guidelines for the management of hyperlipidemia, which is not addressed sufficiently in this manuscript so that these results can be put into an overall context. Further, the QAP-II database used for the analyses summarized in the paper is not described in sufficient detail that would allow the reader to understand how these results might be expected to compare with those based on other databases.

The analyses are not well described and the implications of possible nesting of patients within providers is not addressed. Also, for Table 2, it is not clear what the reference group was for the logistic regression analyses and since this is the key result of the paper, this is an important issue to clear up.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) A more careful and complete addressing of the available literature is critical, a description of the QAP-II database and the implications of the inclusion and exclusion criteria, an addressing of the possible nesting of patients within physicians for the analyses and a clearer description of the analyses.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct) Specify the time period to which the results apply. It is not clear when the QAP-II dataset was created, early or late 1990s, and 10 years can make a substantial difference. If it relates to the early 1990s, the data are over 10 years old and may now be irrelevant.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore) Something seems amiss in the typing of references 4 and 5.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes
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