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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a very interesting concept and well worth disseminating, the article is well constructed and written.

Compulsory

1) I feel the most interesting element and the real new knowledge is the development and roll out of the electronic web module and more details on this should be included in the article.
   e.g. design, format, interactive, initial reaction of participants, were you able to monitor engagement and use.

2) Clearly identify the prescribing QI that were targeted in each topic area

Minor

3) Pg 6 Figure 3 describes the likelihood…….this is quite confusing paragraph and should be rewritten
   The proportion of individuals indicated they will or would likely participate declined to between 58-70% when the detailing involved distance learning this seems to contradict the preceding sentence and may be could be phrased differently.

4) Was prescribing feedback aggregated at the practice level or the individual practitioner level?

5) Having run the pilot report what specific changes would inform a bigger study

6) References on academic detailing are dated; perhaps examine more recent studies using academic detailing

7) label all figures, also include figure footnote n=sample size

8) Table 2 Stratify responses by In person and distance

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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