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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very carefully conceived study although I can not vouch for the rigor of the analytical approach and request a further review by a statistician. The topic is very important and the paper is well written.

Note, in North America many people would have used the term primary care instead of primary health care. PHC is usually thought of as a philosophy of care.

The response rate for the survey completed in the waiting rooms was 70%. It would help to know what the denominator was when calculating this number. Was it the number of patients asked by the receptionist or field researcher to complete the survey or was it the number of patients seen during that time interval in the clinic?

Page 21 (references) is missing.

More detail of the ethics reviews would help.

I look forward to seeing the surveys used.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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
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