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Reviewer's report:

The authors have revised the manuscript carefully according to the comments. I have only two remarks left, then in my opinion the manuscript is ready for publication.

1. Abstract, Results:
I’m afraid there is something wrong with the sentence:
“The association between the patient outcomes was significantly associated with patient orientation and the number of specialized nurses versus doctors (p-value < 0.05).”
In my opinion it should be: „Patient outcomes were significantly associated with patient orientation and ....“

2. Discussion, Limitations:
I still do not understand the last part of the rephrased limitation on page 14 starting after the brackets:
“Next, the highly developed documentation of the ACs on national level is in contrast with the scarcely developed documentation in the clinical setting. As a consequence, gaps exist in the follow-up of patients (e.g. INR values around hospitalization) which could reveal more insight in the influence of chronic care management on the quality of care.”

I do understand that an evaluation of follow-up gaps could give insight into areas for quality improvement outside the ACs (or maybe in cooperation with ACs). But this was not the aim of this study. Maybe the limitation you mean is the following:
“As a consequence, gaps exist in the follow-up of patients (e.g. INR values around hospitalization). These gaps could not be analysed and controlled for. Thus they may have affected the association between patient outcomes and elements of the chronic care model under study.”
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