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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript “The Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care measure: acceptability, reliability and validity in United Kingdom patients with long-term conditions” demonstrated the first analysis of PACIC psychometric properties of a sample of patients in the UK. The manuscript is a valuable addition to the other existing studies about PACIC. However, I would suggest that the term “psychometric properties” should be mentioned in the title of the manuscript. Because there was no retest-test measurement the manuscript demonstrated only psychometric properties of the PACIC.

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract
Method: Please clarify what did you mean with “other data from patients”?
Results: Please mention some statistics in the results section. Please clarify the last sentence of the results section. I do not understand the statement lying behind.

Minor Essential Revisions

Main manuscript
Discussion
The reliability of delivery system design (#= 0.68) is weaker than the other four subscales of PACIC. Some more discussion is needed of this subscale. Maybe there are some reasons which are determined by the system of health service for patients with long-term conditions in the UK.
More explanation is needed within the discussion section regarding the relatively high level of missing data. Please make some assumptions why some items had a higher rate of missing data than others.

Table 1
Table 1 gives a great overview of the different validity studies on the PACIC. However, I miss one study which was undertaken in Germany about the psychometric properties of the PACIC short form. This study was published in the American Journal of Managed Care (2012).

General comments
Please state under each Table the description of the used abbreviations.
Please keep consistent in using for example “5” or “five”. Are the figures 1 to 9 really needed? What is the added value?
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