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Reviewer's report:

General

All the points I raised have been addressed. A few minor points are below.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Tables are not referred to in the text in numerical order.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

It would be helpful in Table 7 to refer to the indicators with the QOF designation, e.g. CHD 3: record of smoking status. Also table 7 could usefully have subheadings of simple process and complex process as well as outcome and treatment.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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