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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
------------------------

1) It would be nice to indicate what is the DDD in quantitative terms.

2) Can author provide references to section of Geographic distribution (page 6)?

3) Page 9: Authors says that:
Such spatial variations carried three statistical meaning: (1) variations were non-random; (2) variations were statistically significant and (3) variations exhibited effects of neighboring interactions.
I wish they could have explained it in more detail.

4) Figure 5 and 6:
I am surprised to see that there are High-High hotspot in Aboriginal Area. Which has not been explained in the discussion section. Some remarks on these interesting results are necessary.

5) Conclusion section
Author says that priority setting in research heavily depends on the neighborhood association.
I do agree with them but how the priorities were set is very subjective. Can the author explain this in the methodology section?

Minor Essential Revisions
---------------------

1) Page 3
"GISs" should be replaced by “GIS”.

2) Figure 1: Specify source of this map. Mention the scale to provide the idea of size.

3) Page 8, Line 7: (2) When both xi and “it” neighbors …..
“it” should be changed to “its”
Discretionary Revisions
---------------------------------

1) Authors says that “We hypothesized there would be significant geographic differences in prescribing cardiovascular medications among townships”. I think it is very natural as evident by many studies. It would have been more interesting to link it by other factors such as social, commercial (income level) and gender etc. I am suggesting to include these factors in this paper but it is a suggestion for future works.

2) Authors have taken only one-year data i.e. year 2004. Which certainly cannot represent clear picture in statistical estimates. I suggest to use include more data from 5 years or so. I am sure data is available.
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