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Reviewer's report:
The authors published data to the important question of the quality of COPD management in primary care. The following remarks have to be made:

i) Did the authors analyze patients with a correct diagnosis with COPD? Did the records include curves for FEV1 and FVC? How many patients labelled as COPD did have no lung function for diagnosing? How many patients did have only prebronchodilation values of COPD? No values of FEV1/FVC were given. They should be included. Did the authors use GLI reference values for lung function? With respect to the data presented it appears that a relevant number of patients under study does not have COPD.

ii) Differences in documentation of data and real management may occur. Do the authors have any measures to reduce this problem?

iii) Were any secondary care interventions during the management of patients labelled as COPD excluded?

iv) Why did the authors group coronary artery disease to vascular conditions instead of grouping the disease into cardiac conditions which has been frequently been done? Was hypertension considered as a comorbidity?

v) Since primary care performance includes management of exacerbations or changes of stable disease it is not convincing that the authors did exclude the management of exacerbations.

vi) The authors should explain the meaning of non-reversible obstruction? Does the term include or exclude patients with partially reversible airflow limitation?

vii) tab. 3: patient education is missed.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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