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Reviewer’s report:

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS
1. The third key point has to be further explained. How was this shown in this manuscript?

The primary sample for this study was the 24 health care centers selected among 90 available public centers. This gives the study a hierarchical structure with the GP’s being at a second level. Questions:

2. The selection process should be explained in more detailed. Were the 24 centers comparable to the rest concerning GP’s clinical experience and interest in hypertension?

3. Potential intra-class correlations should be explored. Were there any systematic differences between the 24 health care centers regarding GP’s attitudes and considerations? A finding of a practice variation would be of a particular interest for the implications of this study.

4. The five cases are chosen to represent different patient categories of interest for the study aim. They are, however, not representative for a population of patients with hypertension in primary care. A patient-based study would probably give a different pattern. This should be stated more clearly.

5. The implications of the study should be discussed in more detail.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS
1. The English language needs professional revision.

2. The discussion is split in many short paragraphs giving an unfocused impression.

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS
1. Abstract end of conclusion: BP should rather be hypertension.

2. Below the headline “Facts case 4, female 62 years 150/80” a double period (..) is found in the second line.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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