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**Reviewer's report:**

- **Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. This is a well-written paper which appears to have accurate information and a reasonable analysis. The difficulty I have with the paper is that I am a US reviewer and it is difficult to imagine that there would be much of a readership for this paper among US health policy people. It is very detailed about particular issues affecting the UK. Thus I would defer to UK reviewers regarding the level of interest this paper would create in the UK.

2. This paper focuses on differences between England and Wales. It would seem likely that similar differences in payment equity among practices might exist within England, and the paper does not comment on these. I am not suggesting that the paper add information on this likelihood because that would be a different research study, but it would be worth commenting on the likelihood that the inequities may be more pervasive than simply between English and Welsh practices.

3. The explanation of how primary care practices are reimbursed is well done and interesting to non-UK readers.

- **Minor Essential Revisions**

4. The paper is well written and if the major issues listed above are addressed, I have no minor revisions to suggest.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.