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**Reviewer's report:**

I have been away and apologise for the delay in reply.

I am happy with the rewritten article.

The authors have addressed my earlier comments.

There are two major changes between the article versions which have not been explained to me. The number of GP practices have declined from 249 in the original article to 239 and Table 1 shows a number of significant changes in the demographics of the GPs. Was there a data flaw in the earlier version?

This change has not significantly changed the conclusions.

In Discussion principal findings the number of hours a GP needs to work to score over 80% on measures of practice performance has declined from 46 in the earlier version to 40 in the last version.

I assume the authors have indicated why these changes have occurred.
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