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Reviewer's report:

Major

According to the applied validation method it is not clear n how many cases (%) the available information were sufficient to perform an acceptable validation (e.g. with regard to DM2 in how many cases there were data regarding blood glycemia levels)

The validation algorithm is not specified . The clinical definition identifies the criterias , the algorythm clarifies the imputation pathways of a specified diagnosis

Minor

The authors apply a formula to estimate the Real Prevalence (Real Prevalence = ( registered prevalence +E - 1 )/ (S +E - 1 ) of a pathology starting from estimated prevalence and from sensitivity and specificity data . This is very interesting but these formula needs validation through at least on bybliographical reference

With reference to the results the general population Hypertension prevalence is substantially lower than most current studies’ estimates . Explanation provided in the article are not fully convincing.

The article's introduction and the methods applied need to be expressed in are linear way . (less confusion )

No information is given regarding the minimun criteria for the data registration required for selecting the clinical records (...The study presents some limitations which are, on one hand, that the information included may not be completely exhaustive) For example : in order to include clinical patients records in a study at least one or two years active data recordings are basically required.
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