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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
Yes, the question is new and well defined. It is an ambitious and brave question: can the effect education by any way be reflected in patient outcome. Most educational studies have only increase of knowledge or skills as outcome measure.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
Yes, they are. There is a very detailed description. Enough to have a clear idea of the recruitment of practices and patients and of the intervention.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
There is nothing that indicates the contrary.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
There is an extensive discussion section, which is very open and honest. It is also audacious to publish so extensively on a study that did not give the intended results.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The abstract is oké, but the title is somewhat too long and thereby looses its attractiveness.

7. Is the writing acceptable? Yes it is. Only some minor language problems.

Please make your report as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories:

• Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a
decision on publication can be reached) NONE AT ALL

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

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore) (FIND MORE ATTRACTIVE TITLE, e.g. head title: effect of education of professionals on patient outcome: evident but no evidence.)

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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