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Reviewer's report:

General comments

The writing is acceptable. The title and abstract accurately convey the text in the main manuscript.

Discretionary Revisions

1) The title is a somewhat long, I suggest dropping the “cross-sectional reference”.

2) In the methods section, last sentence of the paragraph under Analytic Plan: Not sure what bivariate association the authors are referring to because later in the text, there is a reference to unadjusted regressions? This needs to be clarified or the sentence deleted.

Minor Essential Revisions

1) In the abstract, it would be useful if in the results section, the subscales that were significantly associated with PACIC summary scores were listed. The last sentence of the abstract is confusing and hard to follow. Please consider revising and maybe breaking up into two sentences. The underline also distracts and seems out of place in this long sentence.

2) Is there a way to look to examine if utilization impacts the reported findings?

3) How many practices were recruited? I was unclear if this was 40.

4) What was the mean number of chronic conditions for the patients that responded to the survey? What was the insurance breakdown for the patients?

5) What happens to the reported adjusted association when you include a variable that accounts for physicians/PAs/NPs compared to front office staff? It would seem that the reference point for opinions or responses would differ by profession.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) How much data was missing from the primary variables? It is important to list
this to determine if the data is sound. And what are the results if the missing for the scales were not imputed? It's unclear to what scales the authors are referring to but in general it is preferred that outcome variables are not imputed.

2) I’m not sure if I missed this but what is the reason for including information about the Practice Env checklist? I don’t see how this is included in the analysis. Plus, it’s not reported in detail in the results section or tables.

3) Given the heterogeneity of the practices, was there a sensitivity analysis done to explore if characteristics common in low-income practices or community clinics affected the results? For example, proportion on Medicaid, or proportion of patients that are minority as this information was collected as indicated in the manuscript.
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