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Reviewer's report:

The authors have invested a commendable amount of effort to address the suggestions made by the reviewers. The revised version of the manuscript is much improved. There are only 2 points that I suggest to be re-evaluated one more time:

1. Incidence rate versus point prevalence.
   In my opinion, what the authors have evaluated is the point prevalence of hyperkalemia among patients evaluated in a primary care setting, starting with index hyperkalemia and cases of recurring hyperkalemia over a specified period of time. Because we do not know whether the cases of index hyperkalemia are new or recurring/preexisting, this analysis fits better in the definition of point prevalence. (Incidence rate would be limited to only new cases of hyperkalemia).

2. Study design.
   I agree with the point raised by a different reviewer. It might not be sound to state that the study had two designs, and might also be confusing for the readers. In my opinion, this study can be labeled as case-control analysis with cases being followed for an additional period of time to evaluate the rate of hyperkalemia retesting.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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Yes
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