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Reviewer's report:

This paper proposed an interesting topic, aiming to evaluate data quality of interRAI assessment in home and community care. However, to make it easy-reading, this paper requires more clarity about methods and more improvement on the ways to describe data setting and to report results. The statistical analysis results to support the statement of similarity should also be provided.

1. Abstract needs a lot clarity. If possible provide solid indicators/measures/evidence of data quality, such as consistency to support the descriptive results. Please clarify the various statistical techniques used in paper and explain what does 'good quality' mean and what is the 'new method' provided in the Conclusions.

2. Introduction: The introduction runs a little bit overly long to show the study aims and importance of the topic. It is good to give a general overview of the data quality studies in health care, however it stated too many detailed results in other related studies but not a focus of this paper.

3. The paper is overflowing with abbreviations. It makes readers confused and actually increases the difficulties of understanding.

4. A highly related systematic review paper was missing. 'The Resident Assessment Instrument-Minimum Data Set 2.0 quality indicators: a systematic review, BMC Health Services Research 2010 10:166, DOI: 10.1186/1472-6963-10-166'.

5. Data sources: p7, line 19. Four sources should be explained afterwards the statement: 'Data for the present study were obtained from four sources'. Or the article would reads better to move the notes about additional files providing more information about each data setting to the beginning of the Data sources.

6. A table showing all the variables would be very helpful to summarize the detailed information and make paper easy-reading.

7. P 12, line 6, there were only five indicators explained after the authors stated that six particular sets of indicators. What is missing?

8. P22, line 18, please explain what is enough longitudinal CHA data? Was there gold standard or criteria to evaluate 'enough'?
9. P14, the authors stated that 'there were not major differences in the percentage of heart failure clients in HC clients in both provinces …'. Was this 'not major difference' statistically significant? If possible provide p value to support this statement.

10. The result section is to report the basic findings, rather than discussion and comparison of results to other similar studies. It would be better to move the comparison to Discussion section.

11. P17, line 11, what are the cut-off points?

12. On 22, line 4-5, the sentence to describe the sheer number of RAI-HC does not belong to the limitation section. Move it to somewhere else.

**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.

Unable to assess

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

No

**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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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