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Reviewer’s report:

This report will be of great interest in the Nordic countries and in the NHS. However, there is a risk that readers will object to the use of the term “primary health care” as used in the paper. “This is a comparison of apples and pears” may be a recurring comment, and the paper loses some of its value. The comparison is between general practitioners on one hand and specialists on the other, in addition the two groups are working in completely different settings. These differences are the result of conscious, political choices. The outcomes of these choices are shown in this paper. Why not omit the term “primary care” and just describe the facts.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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