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Reviewer's report:

General

This version of the study is a significant improvement over the previous version.

None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Page 4, 1st paragraph:

The authors should make it clear that the $11 billion figure excludes the value of samples left behind in physicians' offices.

Page 4, 2nd paragraph:

In discussing the changing rate of prescribing of CCBs, diuretics and beta blockers the authors language makes it sound as if there is a cause and effect relationship between the volume of promotion and the volume of prescribing. What has been demonstrated is an association not a cause and effect.

Page 6, 2nd paragraph:

It should be "convenience" not "convenient".

Page 7, 1st paragraph:

The sentence "In addition, the reviewers also assessed how these data were graphically presented on the brochures" is vague. The authors should provide a more detailed description of how this assessment was made.

Page 9, last paragraph:

The statement about what Cooper et al showed is not completely accurate. What Cooper said is that 58% of the original research cited in ads was either sponsored by the drug company or had a company affiliated author.

None
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
None

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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