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Review by Svein Gjelstad.

Health Alliance for prudent antibiotic prescribing in patients with Respiratory Tract Infections (HAPPY AUDIT) - impact of a non-randomised multifaceted intervention programme

I have the following comments to the revised manuscript:

**Minor Essential revisions:**

As no control group is described in the manuscript, I suggest that this is explicitly stated in the discussion. It is already stated in the abstract.

The confidence intervals has widened considerably in the revised tables as an effect of the adjustment for clustering on the GP level. However i can see no such change in the confidence intervals in the results section of the manuscript and abstract. Were these confidence intervals already adjusted for clustering in the first manuscript, or is that yet to be done?

**Discretionary revision**

I believe that the grey scales in Figure 2 and figure 3 were clear in the previous version of the manuscript, and suggest that these are kept as they were. However my point in the previous review was aimed at figure 1, where the elements in the legend were not easy to distinguish from each other. Would it be possible to use black, white and grey to distinguish the different elements in the legend and bars in figure 1?

Adjustment for clustering on the GP level is now stated in the article, and I suggest that this is also stated in the describing text for tables 3 and 4.
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**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a
statistician.
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