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Assessment of the coordination of integrated health service delivery networks by the primary health care: COPAS questionnaire validation in the Brazilian context.

1. Is the question proposed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, this is clear.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described.
   About the introduction: it would be helpful if some more information was given about integration and in what way is looked at integration. The figure of the new situation is very abstract; can the authors describe how this works in practice? In line 106 they describe the first level, but it remains unclear what levels are mean. The article describe only very globally the IHSDN that are used in the study, although the focus in on validation of an instrument.

   The used methods seem appropriate, but for more detailed judgement consulting a statistician can be advised.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes. But for interpretation it would be useful to also have an insight in the items of the Copas, not only the topics. This is missing in figure 3.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine?
   Yes, see 3.

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes, however the discussion section could be made richer by comparing the compas with other instruments, and discussing a bit the use of the instrument in practice.

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
See also 5. The last sentence of the conclusion is not clear. The relation between having the PHC as its organizing axis and the usefulness of the instrument should be explained. Will the type of network, or involved parties be an influencing factor for use of the instrument, or also other factors?

7. Are limitations clearly stated?
Only limited, there is some information about what further steps should be, but the limitation of the methods could be more described.

8. Do the authors clearly described where they build upon?
Yes

9. Is the title and abstract correct?
Yes

10. Is the writing acceptable?
Acceptable.
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