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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Aronin,

Thanks very much for the review of our revised paper, Promoting sustainability in quality improvement: An evaluation of a web-based continuing education program in blood pressure measurement (FAMP-D-16-00109R1). We appreciate the chance to improve our paper. Please find below Editor comment as well as our response and text identifying changes that have been made in response to the comment. An updated paper is attached to this application for your review.

We would appreciate if you added a section titled “Supplementary files” where you list the following information about your supplementary material:
Please ensure that all additional files are explicitly referred to in the main text. Any items which do not meet these requirements may be deleted by our production department.

Our response: Thank your for this recommendation. We included a section titled "Supplementary files" describing the Appendices. We explicitly refer to the Appendix in the Methods section and added a reference to Appendix 2, the deidentified dataset, in the Results.

Declarations, page 16, 8th paragraph: Supplementary files: Appendix – Observation Form is the form used by RAs to record demographic information and observations about blood pressure measurement during the intake process. Appendix 2 – Knowledge assessment data is the deidentified dataset containing the results of our pre- and post-module knowledge assessment.

Methods, page 8, 2nd paragraph: If the patient agreed to being observed, RAs collected demographic information and accompanied the patient to the exam room, where the RA recorded observations about blood pressure measurement using a structured form (Appendix) until the intake process ended. Information about the staff conducting the blood pressure measurement was not recorded.

Results, page 10, 4th paragraph: Mean attitudes scores toward correct blood pressure measurement was positive at baseline (mean score 4.2 out of 5) and did not improve significantly post-module (mean score 4.3, p=0.33) (Table 2, Appendix 2).

As recommended we attach a clean copy of the manuscript. We are happy to make any further edits as you recommend.

Thank you again and we look forward to your further review.
Best regards,

Lauren Block MD MPH
Assistant Professor, Hofstra Northwell School of Medicine
lblock2@northwell.edu
5166413188