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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and potentially important article. With NCD interventions being planned all over the country, a systematic facility assessment of primary care centers assessing their preparedness is very important. Although the method to collect information in this study is not very strong and does not involve physical verification, it highlights important gaps that exist in primary health care facilities. However, my comments are as follows:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. Methods: I observe that both the PHCs and CHCs are compared to a common comparator (key items evaluated). I wonder if the requirements by both these health care facilities are the same. CHC's cater to a population of 100,000 and no doubt, would require a different number of human resources and equipments compared to PHCs which caters to a population of 30,000.

2. Methods: It is mentioned that medical officers of 5 districts where NPCDCS has been launched and other 19 districts where it is not yet launched were included in the study. Was there a comparison done between the results of these two groups. Launching of the programme would definitely overcome a few of the factors like equipment, drug availability or point of care supplies. If the analysis has been done and no difference found (may be because the program has just been implemented), it would be useful to mention about it in discussion/results.

3. Methods: Procedure: A facility assessment questionnaire based on IPHS for a PHC and WHO PEN guidelines was developed. IPHS standards for a CHC was not considered. Can the authors provide any reasons for not doing so.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Discussion: 2nd Paragraph - last but 2nd line - 'Manger' to be corrected to 'manager'

2. Discussion: 3rd Paragraph - Reference for the last statement not provided (As it is expected that 70% of the health budget........)

3. Discussion: 6th Paragraph - last but 3rd line - Reference 16 (font) needs to be corrected

4. Discussion: 7th Paragraph - 12th line - 'ceratin' should be 'certain'; 17th line -
Discretionary Revisions:

1. Discussion: Wondering if the gaps in availability of the drugs could be discussed from the aspect of essential drug list for PHC and CHC. For proper implementation of the NCD program, would the authors suggest any changes to the essential drug list.

2. Methods: The total number of health care facilities or medical officers in the 24 districts are not mentioned. This might be important to understand the representativeness/coverage of the study.
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