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Reviewer's report:

General

The article is very long and provides little new or surprising information. As it stands it is too descriptive. It may gain relevance by linking the study with what is known from a theoretical perspective.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Shorten it considerably. The methods can be shortened to max one page, the results can eb shortened as well as the discussion.

Better relation to what is already known on different strategies of implementing change, theories of internal and external determinants of change, other theories. See for example the text book edited by Grol, Wensing and Eccles (2005). There is an extensive literature on implementation research, also in the field of prescribing. Similar models as the APO model have been described in the Netherlands (see for example Veninga et al 2001, van Eick 2001), but also in other countries in Europe (Stalsby Lundberg 1999, Veninga et al 1999). These studies touch upon the same issues, having chosen a bottom-up approach. It has also been described as quality circles or peer review groups in general practice in Germany or The Netherlands. The APO method as described is known in the international literature as PLAN DO STUDY ACT cycle (JCAHC 1993), and has been well studied.

Make clear what the informations adds to what is already known.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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