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Reviewer's report:

This is a relevant paper of modest interest. The results are not very surprising, but nevertheless give insight in experienced continuity by patients related to patient, physician, and practice characteristics

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes, although I would prefer not to mention the methodology that has been used already in the research question (page 6)

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes, to a large extent. The four questions resulting in the main outcome measure (continuity of care) and its scales are not clearly stated (page 7). I would suggest to have these shown in the manuscript.

3. Are the data sound?
Yes, as far as I am able to judge, the data are sound

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes,

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
I can follow the authors in their discussion. One of the issues that might deserve more space is "patient choice". Extended possibilities for patients to chose may in some cases lead to less continuity but on the other hand to better quality and higher levels of patient satisfaction.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
The authors have

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes, the context is clear
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
No, the title could be more directive, but this largely depends on editorial choice.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Certainly. Also for non-native speakers the manuscript is easy to read.

Detailed comments:

Abstract: explain abbreviation PCAT (methods), "experience" instead " of receive" (conclusions)

Methods: it is surprising that these data are already 7 years old!
moreover: explain outcome measure more in detail.

page 7: "outcome .." second line: "provider" instead of "provide"?

Page 8: to help the readership the authors might provide the reader with interpretations of effect sizes (low, avarage, high etc)

"Question one" and "question two": better to repeat the question or name the theme. (pge 8)

Revise table titles (editors?)

Table 1: abbreviations CHF and CAD are not in the table. text under table needs to be revised

Table 2. family physician profile?

Table 4 : NS not in table, RPN not in table etc

A matter of taste: the values for continuity scores are not shown.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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