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Reviewer's report:

General Comments:
This is an important topic (improving family history taking) and using chart audits to improve provider performance is also important. The authors should focus their manuscript on the results of the intervention as a reporting of a quality improvement project. The literature review should be removed from the methods and results – it is important for performing the study but not reporting the study.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. The literature review is an important part of the background of the study put should not be published as results of this study. It may be appropriate to state that “a literature review informed the intervention” and discuss those evidence based interventions.
2. The section discussing “technical successes and issues” is not necessary and should be omitted.
3. I am not sure Box 1 is meaningful. This methodology could just be sited as a reference.
4. A table describing the demographic of each practice should be included.
5. Figures 2 and 3 should be combined into one figure (bars for 1st and 2nd collection for each practice).
6. Figure S1 is actually important and should be in the main manuscript. The aims as written in the introduction are too general and hard to understand. A more specific discussion would be helpful.
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Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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