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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written and elegantly presented paper on an important topic. The sample size and the power of the comparison adds considerable weight to current debates on the effects of forms of remuneration on physician behaviour.

The comparators need more detailed description - how does fee-for-service work in Ontario. What is the main form of capitation - does it relate to a bundled payment, possibly excluding periodic health checks. More detail on these rival payment systems would be useful, as this paper should receive a lot of interest in other settings having similar debates.

My comments are very minor:

lines 83-85 something is missing from this sentence.

line 178 correctly cautions us that 'causation is not established'. The tone of the discussion on 170-171 is considerably less cautious, and undermines the careful presentation of the rest of the analysis.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
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