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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions

1. Page 12: “Thus, after the changes to financial incentives in November 2011, a significant increase was observed in the proportion of enrolled patients who were non vulnerable, with a corresponding significant decrease in the proportion of enrolled patients who were vulnerable.” Decrease is inconsistent with the preceding text, where you say “the number of vulnerable patients enrolled through GACOs increased only slightly (p <0.001)” and “The increases in both vulnerable and non-vulnerable patients were significant”. Is this a typo?

2. Page 21: “This study showed that a change in financial incentives did not increase the number of vulnerable patients being enrolled with family physicians.” This statement is inconsistent with the results section, where you describe a significant increase in the number of vulnerable patients enrolled through GAGOs after the change in financial incentives. This needs to be fixed.

3. The discussion surrounding Table 1 is much improved. A few questions and comments remain:
   a. What does “x per period” mean? From the text I conclude you mean “average per period”, but this needs to be clear from the table itself.
   b. You need to add the number of observations from each regression in the table. Based on your last response to reviewer comments, I believe N=65.
   c. Why is the p-value column for the “Priority 1: less than 30 days” row empty?
   d. The use of decimal points and commas is inconsistent.
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