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Reviewer's report:

The findings from this article provide an important contribution to the D&I literature. Audit and Feedback is generally accepted as an evidence based strategy for enhancing implementation of evidence based guidelines. Yet, as noted by the authors, systematic reviews show that the effect size is small and there is no theory informed consensus on how to improve and/or optimize the impact of this intervention.

There were a couple of minor items in the methods section that could use some clarity. Specifically, more detail related to the participants is needed to understand the criteria for inclusion. For example, can we assume they being published in their area of expertise was required and what does it mean to have "experience in feedback"? What type of experience was required to meet eligibility criteria? Finally, does this work apply only to primary care settings or do the authors believe it be generalizable to other delivery settings/systems?

The use of the term "member checking" was a little confusing. Wasn't this simply a component of the analysis?

The discussion and/or conclusion do suggest some next steps but more specificity in would add to the paper's value (suggested research priorities)
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