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Reviewer’s report:

This study assessed the effects of gatekeeping system on the quality of primary care based on propensity score matching method, which has great value as a reference for the primary healthcare system reform in China. Although it was conducted in two cities only, they have relatively good representativeness in China. There are some problems needed to be improved.

1. We divided the participants into two groups (gatekeeping and non-gatekeeping) according to their type of insurance. (Line 195)

   How did the authors divide the participants into two groups? The methods or standard for category should be explained in details.

2. in the discussion section, why did the participants in gatekeeping group have lower scores in the domain of accessibility and continuity? Please explain the reason for this phenomenon. At present, the listed reasons for this phenomenon (such as shortage of GP, patients calling system) have effects on both the gatekeeping and non-gatekeeping group.

3. the survey method and results should not be presented in discussion section again.

4. there are some places where the use of English could be improved. For example, the setting this investigation was that most CHCs use a ‘patients calling system’(Line 330).

   Compared to 2000 in Portugal, 1500 in England and 2100 in USA. (Line 317)

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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