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Reviewer’s report:

Quality of written English Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review The manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Not enough
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Not enough
3. Are the data sound? Yes
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? No, the discussion is insufficient
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes

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

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Please clarify the features/differences of the two models at introduction.
Please discuss the results of the 5 tables!
Table 2 [mean (95%CI) or N(%)] => [mean±SD] and N(%) are not presented!!!!

Minor Essential Revisions
The title of table 3 is not clear . It must be changed! Suggestion: Prevalence ratio of low score in PHC, by type of care model and chronic condition…

In the text:
(The association between PHC scores, were lower in the BHU units than those with FHS: incorrect=>The prevalence of low scores were higher in BHU model… independently of the major problem (and other confounding factors for patients...
treated in both models incorrect => no confounding were controlled for in table 3) (Table 3).
In all chronic conditions, the scores were higher among patients treated in units with FHS: commentary: Table 3 presents the prevalence of high/low PHC score by model in presence/absence of a heath condition. So is preferable to say that the prevalence of high scores were higher in FHS model...

Table 4 Modelo=> Model

The title of table 5 is not clear . The coefficient for chronic condition is not presented, it appears just as confounding variable. Suggestion: Adjusted linear association between PHC and Physical or Mental component of quality of life score.
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