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Reviewer's report:

This review of a committee lacks several important elements of critical transparency. There is a lack of clarity about how the committee discussed was selected, what its terms of reference where (to advice the EC?), what the target audience of its publications were, how was the demand for this commission determined, was there a political background (request by Parliament of the MS?). Has there been independent scientific reviews of the publications? What has the Commission done with it? Does it have any relation to other EC related processes, i.e. on NCD's, healthy ageing, JAF Health, etc. In addition it is far from clear in several places whether we read the author's opinion or a summary of the committees publications. Why have these 'important' publications not been reviewed in scientific journals. What are the ifs and buts....?? Does it really help to have such an enormously broad definition of primary care? Can we find any critical comments anywhere? Has the Commission asked the Member States for comments and whether they thought these publications useful? How do OECD and WHO (Observatory) rate these publications?

In short...to vague, not really critical and finally....what is the message? Do it again, take up the recommendations (and how?), do it again with another procedure?
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