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Reviewer's report:

The authors have done a good job addressing the reviewers' concerns and the paper is clearer now. However, I still believe that the regression analyses are not correct. Hierarchical regression is not the same as stepwise regression. Hierarchical regression accounts for the fact that patients are nested within providers. Thus, there are two levels. In SAS the program is GEE - generalized estimating equations. Once done, the results would be best presented in a table.

A couple of minor comments:

Line 323: Cannot really say "especially in the intervention group." if there is no significant difference between the intervention and comparator groups.

Line 329: seems like "groups" is extraneous.

Line 333: suggest adding "but not significantly" after "moderately."

Line 336: Suggest deleting "The."

Line 337: Suggest ending sentence at "...CDS when used alone." then begin new sentence and paragraph with the second point about 19-64-year olds. (combine with next paragraph)

The Discussion might consider mentioning that High risk 19-64-year olds might see specialists and receive vaccines there.
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