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Reviewer's report:

Review: Nation-scale adoption of new medicines by doctors: an application of the Bass diffusion model

This paper presents a study that examined the adoption of innovative medicines in the Australian prescription market by using a bass diffusion model. It is here made a very interesting question and scientifically handled adequately. Yet I can not agree to publication of the present manuscript, unfortunately, and would ask for an urgent revision of the recommendations listed below.

Major Compulsory Revision:

1. The background is represented in proportion to the whole article at great length. This applies especially to the basics of bass diffusion model, which will be provided to the interested reader as an existing knowledge or can be looked up in appropriate sources.

2. The same applies to the Conclusion that should be more concise and should make no reference to sources.

3. On page 5 is already referred to social networks, although later in the text, this is accomplished. The order should be changed here and the reference "see below" omitted. This would also avoid the two-time insertion of the reference Iyengar, van den Bulte and Valente.

4. The individual chapters are not clearly separated from each other in content. For example, methods already included results. Similarly, a detailed description of statins is not part of the study design. In results, however, the results are not presented purely factual, but discussed and placed in the overall context. The conclusion contains parts that are more suitable for discussion. This total should again be revised.

5. The Figure 3 is in very poor quality. It is unclear, contains too much information. The reader is overwhelmed with it.

Minor Essential Revision:

6. There is no source indicated on Figure 1. Was the figure created by the authors, based on what data?
7. In the title of Figure 2 occurs twice in.

8. The order of the manuscript is not right. According to the Guidelines for the authors: conclusion prior methods.

**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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