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Reviewer’s report:

The revised manuscript has improved and addressed most important points raised during the earlier review (see minor but nevertheless noteworthy exceptions below). Nevertheless, there are several additional minor editorial issues that should be addressed, as listed below:

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Consider changing "Heart Disease" to "Coronary Heart Disease" in the title to be more specific.

2. (Repeated) On page 8 of revised manuscript, under Tailored Adherence Messages, note that the middle of the paragraph has a smaller font size than other places.

3. In the Methods section (under Measures - Change in Predicted Global CHD Risk) (Page 10, second paragraph of revised manuscript), the authors describe additional "sensitivity analyses to determine whether modeling the effects of each CHD risk reducing strategy...on baseline CHD risk produced different results..." It is still unclear to me what exactly the authors did in the sensitivity analyses. Consider rephrasing the sentence and please be more specific. The prior sentence that describes the first sensitivity analysis by "recalculating predicted global CHF risk using a 23% risk reduction for men and a 0% reduction for women" is a good example of clear analysis description.

4. The term "MI" (clearly for "myocardial infarction") is used both in the body and in the abstract without introducing what it stands for.

5. In the Results section (under Effect of the Intervention on Predicted Global CHD Risk) (Page 13, first paragraph of revised manuscript), the ending of the first sentence is somewhat awkward. Consider revising, for example, to "...with a larger effect in the pre-specified high risk subgroup, although it was not statistically significant due to a small sample (see Table 2)."

6. Consider using the symbols in the tables (esp. Tables 1, 3, and 4) in the following sequence: *, †, ‡, §, ¶, ‡‡, §§, ††, †††, ††‡, etc. in accordance with the ICMJE guidelines at http://www.icmje.org/manuscript_1prepare.html.
7. (Repeated) Apart from the descriptive statistics, Table 1 should indicate which characteristic is statistically different between the intervention and control groups using t-tests or chi-square tests as appropriate. This is especially important since the authors noted some baseline differences (e.g., education) in the text. If none was statistically significant, note it so in the footnote of the table.

8. Table 1: Consider revising the characteristic descriptions to make them clearer. For instance, "Prescription drug plan" should be "Enrolled in a prescription drug plan." I also echo another reviewer's previous comment that "Planned best evidence interventions" even with an added footnote description, is still unclear. Also check inconsistent capitalizations.

9. Add the proper unit of measurement for Table 1 under "Potentially Modifiable CHD Risk Factors: BP>140/90. Also check if "Mean HDL cholesterol (md/dL)" has the proper unit (md/dL vs. mg/dL).

10. Table 1: Abbreviations CHD, BP, TC/HDL, SBP, DBP not defined.

11. Table 2: Abbreviation CHD not defined.

12. Table 2: Please be consistent in using leading zeroes when reporting estimates of effect sizes and confidence intervals (e.g., -.75% should be -0.75% or vice versa but be consistent).

13. Table 3: Abbreviations CHD, BP, OR not defined.

14. Table 4: Abbreviations RF, HTN, and HDL-c not defined.

15. Figure 1: Abbreviations RA, CHD not defined. Also change "186 patients agree to participate" to past tense, and make "(Usual care)" under control arm bold face to be consistent.

16. Figure 2: Abbreviations CHD and BP not defined.

17. (Repeated) On supplementary Appendix 2, under the row "Cost", note that the last bullet in the right-hand column has a misplaced opening parenthesis.
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