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Reviewer's report:

General
The article has improved. However, I maintain my opinion that to researchers in the field of improving prescribing or quality of prescribing, it provides little new information. The theoretical perspective comes in the discussion very superficially. The study does not result in new hypotheses nor does it provide new perspectives. In fact, AOP and comparable approaches were developed as a bottom-up approach because that fits in with views of professionals. So, what the study does is provide some evidence that the intention of APO-like approaches fits indeed with views of GPs.

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

Put the APO approach in a wider, international perspective. Some authors were mentioned before. It suffices here that I think the study should refer to similar approaches in Belgium, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Germany....

APO was developed as a bottom-up approach to fit in with views of the (GP)-profession. The study shows, that has succeeded

The results are not discussed in relation to the fact that APO like approaches have mixed results (see Grimshaw 2004), but also the studies mentioned earlier

The results should be discussed in view of a wider (international) context in Quality of Care, such as the QoF in the UK, where top-down approaches may not be well liked, but effective.

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

The authors use the term 'quality work' to describe the top-down approach. I am not familiar with that term from other quality of care literature; maybe it is a Danish like description, of 'quality of care policy'

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