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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript is clear, well written and presents an interesting study. It is a pleasure to review a manuscript with a well-constructed narrative and few errors. I have only minor suggestions for revision.

1) The manuscript changes tense in a few places (eg lines 116-125, 182). Most of the manuscript is in past tense, which is what I would expect (with the exception of future directions in the discussion/conclusion) so it would improve consistency/flow to correct the places where tense switches to present tense.

2) There are some terms that need some explanation for an international audience. In Table 4, what are "county health ranking" and "PCMH status", and on page 11, line 220, what does "providers who met the meaningful use eligibility requirements" mean?

3) The discussion is an excellent summary and reflection on key findings, but is limited in the seating of the findings in the context of the wider literature, particularly that cited in the introduction. It would benefit from one-two additional paragraphs reflecting on how the findings relate to the field more broadly and compare with/add to the literature.
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