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Reviewer’s report:

Point-to-point response to Authors’ responses:

1. The authors have added on information about the measures such as EI, RI, and SI. However, the appendix about the clinical outcome measures are in Spanish that I am not able to figure out.

2. The authors redefine and explain the PHCs and BCTs and their relationship in the revised manuscript.

3. The typo “ICD-9-MC” has not been corrected. The authors did not reconfirm them before submission.

4. Last time I suggest to use fewer parameters in comparison. For example, to deselect the visit-based EI. The authors echo my suggestion but did not change anything except remove the visit EI from the Table 5.

5. I am not convinced that the authors adopted Synthetic Index (SI) representing the effectiveness or outcomes of the PHC and BCTs. The authors provide comprehensive Technical Report for reference in Spanish that I could not read. The validity and reliability of using a proxy index based on 20 indicators is questioned. The authors had better elaborate more on the sensitivity and specificity of the SI to the effectiveness of PHCs.

6. The validity, reliability, sensitivity, and specificity of the RI, SI, and EI are crucial to the comparison between ACG-based efficiency and effectiveness. I wonder if almost all measures are proxy indicators for both efficiency and effectiveness, how confident the authors could draw a conclusion to their relationship--- the main purpose of the study.
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