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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

The manuscript requires substantial revision and the quality of the research cannot be assessed as written. Please find high level comments that should be used to rework the publication.

The abstract should be revised with the aim of making a good initial impression which will engage the reader. The abstract should be substantially revised. The same kinds of issues (listed below) are found throughout the rest of the manuscript as well and should be revised as applicable.

1. Assertions made such as "To obtain epidemiological information from representative samples of the population, it is necessary to turn to secondary sources..." should be tempered to say something such as "To obtain epidemiological information from representative samples of the population, it may be necessary to turn to secondary sources...". Please review similar strong assertions throughout the paper and make revisions as suggested.

2. Proper names should be capitalized and it is not clear why "Primary Health Care" is capitalized. If it is a proper name, please add clarification to that effect in the publication.

3. The abstract contains a sentence which says "contain clinical-administrative information of an elevated percentage of the population". I am not sure what is meant by this statement.

4. In sum, the publication begins with confusing and grammatically incorrect sentences and it is not possible to comment on the research with the abstract and the subsequent sections of the manuscript in its current form.

Generally, wording should be clarified and punctuation should be edited. For example, "diagnosis registered" should likely be something to the effect of "diagnosis documented". Similarly, the phrase "random sampling" should likely be "random sample". In terms of punctuation, the use of the comma in statistical values should likely be a period (99,53 vs. 99.53).

Abbreviations are used at times (OMI-AP, BIFAP) without being initially spelled out.

Attention should be given to appropriateness of wording. Some words such as "exhausivity" are not correct.
The description of the methods is not clear. For example, in the section related to the study population the authors state, “We selected the episodes by means of diagnostic codes, without paying attention to the labels. Therefore, selection bias may occur in those cases in which the professional registering the episodes modified the label.” It is unclear what is meant by "label" and how the label would impact the research methods.
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**Declaration of competing interests:**

'I declare that I have no competing interests’