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Author's response to reviews: see over
23 January 2009

Curt Furberg, PhD
Editor-in-Chief (U.S.), Trials
Via the internet

Re: MS 1225482345232623

Dear Dr. Furberg:

On behalf of my coauthors, I am submitting a revised version of the manuscript titled “Hypertension Improvement Project (HIP): study protocol and implementation challenges” for your consideration.

We are grateful for the reviewer’s careful reading of the manuscript and have made the corrections that he suggested (see attached page). In addition, your Editorial Board had raised concerns regarding the status of the trial. The August 2008 date listed in clinicaltrials.gov indicated the month by which we completed the final 18-month data collection from participants. To clarify, the HIP trial is still in the data cleaning and analysis phase, and we have added language to this effect in the introduction and statistical analysis sections. Please let us know if additional information is required.

Thank you for your continued consideration, and we look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Rowena J. Dolor, MD, MHS
Duke Primary Care Research Consortium
Duke University Medical Center
Response to Reviewer's Report:

I have reviewed the manuscript, Hypertension Improvement Project (HIP): study protocol and implementation challenges. It is quite complete and well-written. It covers all of the key points necessary for a protocol and I have just a few comments.

In two places (page 4, Abstract Discussion; page 14, just prior to the Physician measurements section) there are typos for the numbers of patients in each group. Rather than 189 and 185, they should be 289 and 289.

Thank you for pointing out this mistake. The correct numbers are 289 and 285 (total 574 participants). We have corrected this error.

On page 5, four lines from bottom, “<” should be “>.”

We have corrected this typo as well.