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Reviewer’s report:

The article aims to describe the implementation of the EHIS 2 into the German Health Monitoring system. The authors reviewed the methodology, particularly the sampling methods and the response rates, and the problems that they are facing to have European comparable indicators without disrupting the German series.

Some points that could be addressed and improved by the authors:

In Methods section:

Could you explain more the stratified sampling selection and sampling frame? How many communities are in Germany? How many districts?

Where do SSUs selected into the PSUs by a simple random sampling?

Table 1 could have the same order than the text: health status, health determinants, health care, demographics /social variables.

In Discussion section:

It seems that the weight design sample does not show differences in education with the reference population, but the authors could discuss (as they do with the previous telephone surveys) if there are any difference by age and sex between the web and the paper response, since that is an important issue in data collection.
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