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Reviewer's report:

This is generally a well-written and scientifically sound article on a topic of interest to practitioners and researchers as well. I had no major compulsory revisions. In the category of Minor Essential Revisions, first, I would suggest that in the Methods section the authors display the data collected in a tabular format that would indicate what data including instruments used, the variables that instrument yielded, and the intervals at which each type of data was collected. This would make it much easier to understand what was done and when. Second, I think the authors need to clarify the time periods of the required EPSDT visits. The first category says by 6 months (does that include the 6 month visit or up to 6 mo?) then between 6 and 12 months (are 6 month and 12 month visits included in this interval/), etc for the rest of intervals. This needs clarification. The intervals were presented more clearly on p9 in the second paragraph of the results. The third item in this category is to tell how many children were excluded because they attended practices out of the network. (second paragraph under the Outcome section) Lastly, I do not think it is correct to say that "adherence was predicted most strongly by maternal prenatal care adherence". That was one of the stronger but not the strongest predictor. In the category of Discretionary Revisions - In the first paragraph of the background is it not clear if WCC and immunization adherence are meant to be the same thing. Would be nice to know how the SF 36 was scored. For the Confidence Intervals on Figure 1 would be nice to see the numbers. There is a long awkward sentence in p. 13 beginning with "Mitigating this potential ....".

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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