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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

The authors have made changes to the literature review included in the Background section to support the need for this research. The authors have increased the number of pages from a page and half to three and half pages. However, there are problems with the literature review:

1. The following provides support for the research and is well stated:
   “Since Solberg’s study had limited generalizability based on geographic representation, and a relationship was found between hypertension management (though not BP control) and use of CMP, we sought to evaluate hypertension management among diabetic patients using a more geographically diverse sample of primary care practices. Importantly, Solberg’s 2005 study did not include a measure of service integration, and to our knowledge the relationship between service integration and BP control among diabetic hypertensive patients has not been previously studied. “
   However, Instead of “we”, third person should be used. Check the spelling of “generalizability”.

2. The paragraph that presents diabetes care studies, ACIC is used and this not spelled out first so the reader does not understand ACIC. In addition a transition sentence needs to be inserted to tell the reader why the research presented is of importance to the study. In addition, the references are introduced out of order.
   “The ACIC is an older tool that uses a framework similar to the PPC to assess chronic illness care, and early CMP research using the ACIC found a relationship between some ACIC subscores and quality of diabetes care [12] [13].”

3. Solberg et al. study is not referenced. The reader cannot tell which reference the authors are referring. I believe it the ninth reference.
   “Solberg et al. conducted a cross-sectional survey of 97 directors from large medical groups geographically distributed across the US and found….”

4. The following is essentially a repeat of what was stated in the beginning of the section (see above):
   “Since prior research had limited generalizability based on narrow geographic representation[8, 15, 16], and a relationship was found between hypertension management (though not BP control) and use of CMP[8], we sought to further
evaluate hypertension management among diabetic patients using a geographically diverse sample of primary care practices in the US. Furthermore, since prior research did not include a measure of service integration, we sought to evaluate the relationship between diabetic hypertension management and service integration.

Due to the above edits and the nature of the edits (Major Compulsory Revisions), I cannot recommend accepting this manuscript until the edits are addressed.

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

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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