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Reviewer's report:

The authors have responded to each of the reviewers’ concerns. The paper’s organization and clarity are improved. The remaining issues are mostly minor.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Abstract contains sentence fragments and grammatical errors — please review and correct.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. (Page 7 — Identification, assessment) Please include sentence about how the practices were assigned. This is a non-randomized trial — would be helpful to understand how/why practices were assigned to intervention/control groups.

2. (Page 8 and ongoing) — You often include 95% confidence intervals (e.g. for %patients excluded). This is not necessary unless you are making a comparison between intervention and control groups and makes it harder to read the manuscript.

3. (page 8) — I understand what it means for a patient to be assessed at an intervention practice. Please provide a definition for what assessed means at a control practice. Likewise, what is definition of eligible for drug treatment at an intervention practice?

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, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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