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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? - Not totally new but an important question that is well defined.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? - Yes. I did a somewhat similar national study that use some of the same methods back in the 1960s, and also had ~640 cells in the analytical matrix that took into account age, sex, residence, insurance system, education and income. Deja vu all over again.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled? - Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? - Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? - Yes

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? - Yes

7. Is the writing acceptable? - Yes, a pleasure to read.

I strongly recommend publication.

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) - None suggested

- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct) - None suggested

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore) - None suggested. Ideally, I
would have liked to have at least a brief comment on indicators of GP over- or under-workload in big city areas, and perhaps a brief discussion of the degree to which the average visits/per capita in those areas, ~7, is considered "adequate" or not. But, very minor points and not essential to the main thrust of the article.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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