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Reviewer's report:

This paper makes significant contributions to a global understanding and development of primary care. It is densely written and packs in a lot of information.

Minor Revisions recommended; the first sentence in the abstract should include the word "primary care", then add what is missing prior to making the case that there is a lack of information. The PHAMEU is an important concept but obscures that you have developed a monitoring process. A Monitor and the use of the word "monitor" escaped me until I realized you had developed a monitoring system. Such is the nature of English but others may find this noun and verb use as confusing as I did.

It was not clear to me why you limited the literature between 2003-mid 2008. I suggest one short sentence justifying the time span.

Equity in health needs a one sentence definition. The authors are reaching across many countries and not having a definition may produce some ambiguity or misunderstanding.

Should the Results Section include the number of papers identified for inclusion in the systematic review?

Conclusion: I suggest a better conclusion statement than stating the obvious - what you developed. This is a dynamic system created for widespread use and has enormous potential to improve an international understanding of care delivery. Perhaps if you state that comparing and contrasting health care resources across countries provides opportunities to enrich nations in decision making.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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