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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

• The authors state the outcomes measures reported in this paper are superior to traditional outcome measures. They must support this point with data. They cannot say “we found that measuring proportions in control without evaluating whether physicians respond appropriately to poor risk factor control largely underestimated quality of care,” without proving the superiority. In other words, do these outcomes correlate with morbidity and mortality for individual patients and why should they replace current measures when considering the care provided by a physician to a population of patients?

• The abstract does not sufficiently explain the rationale for or methods of the study.

• The definition of “appropriate clinical action” is subjective. The component parts should be examined separately, as this is a composite endpoint.

• The authors state, “To our knowledge, this is the first study to document appropriate physician response to poor control of cardiovascular risk factors and potential overtreatment in a country without systematic quality monitoring.”

• The Methods section states facts about the Population in the section on Measures. Also, covariates section is disorganized and does not explain why these are being entertained as potential confounders.

• The Results section is missing the results of the multivariate analysis.

• The Results section should clearly report the traditional quality measures, then the new outcome measures, then the Discussion should compare the two. “Suboptimal care for poorly controlled cardiovascular risk factors was provided to 15% to 62% of patients at 12 months in our study,” should come near the beginning of the Discussion section.

• Table 3 seemed out of place. Please explain why it is necessary.

• Figures 1 and 2 are not necessary. Appendix Table 1 is okay but the rest is not necessary.

Minor Essential Revisions

• The Introduction and Discussion both need to be better organized. Also, there
are incorrect prepositions used in several places.

Discretionary Revisions
None

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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