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Reviewer's report:

General
The authors pose an important question “what processes of change are used to implement clinical guidelines in primary care? The authors have the opportunity to compare high and low performing sites and explore the differences in processes of change across sites that may account for differences in performance.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
Sample - The authors indicate that they purposively sampled practices. What guided the purposeful sampling? What were the general characteristics of the sites included in the study (e.g. number of employees, employee mix, number of patients seen, etc.)? Also, provide information on what disciplines and how many were interviewed at each site.

Data Collection/Analysis “Given that Microsystems in Healthcare was your guiding framework, it would be helpful to readers if you presented that framework early in the article. Further, you indicate that your initial codes were developed using empiric sources from the literature about change. It would help to provide reader with some sense of the initial framework you applied to coding the data.

Results “Make the case more clearly for your findings as a framework as opposed to a list. Figure 1 provides some sense of how the items are interrelated, but this could be developed more fully in the text.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Results- The results section includes the results of the interviews but does not appear to include observation data. Also, all examples pertain to successful sites. The presentation of results does not capture the potential richness of your sample which included high, moderate, and low performing sites. Did your analysis include any comparisons between what you found across sites with different levels of performance and how could you present that?

Discussion “The discussion addresses challenges in implementing EMRs, which distracts. The study’s goal was to look at implementation of clinical guidelines, and EMRs were one strategy used to implement those guidelines. The Discussion section could benefit from being organized more closely around the findings.

When you reference the title of your framework in the abstract, make clear that this is the framework you developed in your study.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory 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.