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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

I appreciate your effort to review the article taking in consideration my previous comments. I think that it is now clearer and more intelligible for the readers.

Abstract

It became clearer with the modifications performed. Nevertheless, regarding the methods, the Farmaka comes out in the text, as everybody knows what it is. In introduction, it is explained accordingly. I suggest to suppress it from the abstract.

Introduction

It became more intelligible, with the clarification of the study purposes, the public policy that addresses them, and the need for more evidences to sustain its continuity and improvements. Regarding the Farmaka, it needs to be standardized if is written in capital letters or not. I also suggest to change the verb tense in the final paragraph from the future to past tense.

Methods

They became clearer, although it is still complex. The subsections are helpful as well as the explanations. However, it became too long. It is not a problem itself, but would be welcome to make it easier for the readers.
Results

They became clearer with the violation scenarios of the ITT and per protocol analyses.

Discussion

The effectiveness encountered is well written opening the discussion right now, regarding the primary outcome, "confirming the usefulness of the ADS in improving appropriate prescribing of pain relief medication." The discussion of this issue is stronger with the references added. I apologize to the authors regarding my confusing between Flemish and Dutch languages, regarding the Boggermans et al. paper. I also appreciate to replace it by the English version that has made more understandable the Belgium context of ADS.

Regarding the ADs profile, the discussion added has improved the understanding about possible explanations of their impact on GP prescribing. On the other hand, would be welcome that the authors explain to the readers that this issue will be addressed in a further publication.

The information about paracetamol reimbursement data, the lack of consensus of its precise indication in OA, the eligible practices missed, as well as the short-term effects, enriched the discussion about the study limitations.

Conclusions

I agree with the conclusions stated by the authors.
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