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Reviewer's report:

This study provides data on implementation factors related to the implementation of cardiovascular disease preventive performance. Such studies are highly important as there is limited data that specifically identifies barriers and facilitators related to evidence-based guideline implementation in primary care practices. However, before this manuscript can be considered suitable for publication here are some thoughts and comments for the authors to consider.

1. It is apparent that this study takes an implementation science methodology. Yet, the authors do not describe or provide an acceptable framework in which data was assessed. There are several implementation science framework's that may be suitable for this publication. This may re-organize how the data is presented in the rest of the manuscript.

2. In the lines 40 through 43; page 4 it is not clear how the interview guides were developed. Were the interviews used to make and modify subsequent interview guides or were interview guides developed for the interviews? If so, it should be explained how the interview guides were initially developed.

3. In the quantitative analysis section starting on line 25; page 5 it was not clear how significance testing was assessed. In addition, the author's selected differences of 10% and 20% from the pre-to post intervention as meaningful differences. It must be explained why these percentages were chosen.

4. In the lines 46 through 53; page 5 the authors discuss quantitative and qualitative findings were compared and used to explain outcome differences. Further information is needed if these assessments were done by independent reviewers and then by consensus. In addition, further explanation is needed to explain what is a "case study approach".

5. In line 36-37; page 6, the authors state that all clinics with the exception of practice C demonstrated major improvement. The authors should provide some information what is considered a major improvement.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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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