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Reviewer's report:

The numbering of comments in this review is identical with the numbering of the former review.

Introduction

- there is no further comment

Methods

1. comment: there is no further comment

2. comment: there is no further comment

3. comment: answers and modifications are acceptable, but, the review of the literature as a source of questionnaire should be supported by references; and the pilot testing should be also described - since its appropriateness is critical for validity of the paper

4. comment: answers and modifications are acceptable, but, it would be helpful for international readers to add some sentences about the legal and financial relationship between traditional and new PCN professionals. There are many similar attempt worldwide (our working group is involved in a similar program), and this aspects have high importance.

5. comment: in spite of the modification in the text, the originally mentioned problem is not solved; it was clear from the manuscript that there was no data collection before the PCN program's launching, consequently, the changes of practice parameters in PCN and non-PCN can not be compared (this before-after analysis could be the most convincing evidence for improvement of the care; without this approach and taking into consideration the significant differences between PCN and non-PCN practices in the
respect of size of community and clinical practice organization, without controlling for these two factors in statistical analysis, the influence of these two factors and the PCN organization can not be separated from each other, consequently the answer to the study question can not be answered. (The paper deals with a very important topic, a consultation with a statistician could be very helpful to improve the validity and convincing power of the paper.)

Results

1. comment: answers and modifications are acceptable, but: Although, the low response rate as a limitation is acknowledged, the main point is that the influence of this limitation on the statistical results and on the main conclusions should be explicitly discussed (e.g.: is there selection bias due to the voluntary participation in the PCN program?).

2. comment: see Methods-4

3. comment: there is no further comment

4. comment: see Methods-4

5. comment: there is no further comment

6. comment: there is no further comment

Discussion

1. comment: there is no further comment

2. comment: see Methods-4

3. comment: there is no further comment

4. comment: see Methods-4
5. comment: Although, the low response rate as a limitation is acknowledged, the main point is that the influence of this limitation on the statistical results and on the main conclusions should be explicitly discussed (e.g.: is there selection bias due to the voluntary participation in the PCN program?).

Conclusions

the problems mentioned in the first review are not solved (lack of confounding control and selection bias is not handled/discussed properly)
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