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Reviewer’s report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
I have a few issues with the main thrusts of this paper which should be addressed before a decision on publication can be reached

1. There does seem to be an increase in prescribing according to guidelines after the guidelines were issued. However, it is difficult to ascribe this observation solely to the effect of the guidelines, based on the temporal sequence. Given a lack of description about events leading up to the guidelines and their dissemination (eg. How was information regarding the guidelines disseminated?) we are not clear how much of this change can be attributed to the change in guidelines, and how much of it can be attributed to other factors (eg. publicity, new trial findings, etc)

2. The rationale for the choice of this geographic location is not clear. Extrapolating changes in prescribing patterns in a constituency in London is difficult especially when not much details are given about the makeup, population and other sociodemographic factors in this community

3. I would also suggest that the authors include additional components to their work (eg. interviews with general practitioners to better understand some of the rationales behind their clinical choices and also the reasons for divergences from guidelines, if any). Rather than just relying on the retrospective data to project treatment trends, this would result in a fuller and richer treatment of the data.

Minor essential revisions:

There are quite a few grammatical errors and spelling errors scattered throughout the manuscript. I list some below, but would advise the authors to thoroughly vet their manuscript again before submission.


2. Abstract: Methods
“28 general practices in Wandsworth, London were conducted”- change “were” to “was”

3. Intro, second para:
Variations in hypertension treatment across primary care practices
“have additionally documented the gap between guidelines and physician chooses”- change chooses to choices

4. Methods, second para:
“We defined a patient with an additional cardiovascular comorbidity as one who had
one or more of the following diseases diabetes mellitus”- change to “diseases: diabetes mellitus”
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