

Reviewer's report

Title: Quality of chronic disease care in general practice: the development and validation of a quick measurement tool

Version: 1 **Date:** 26 October 2006

Reviewer: Jacques van Eijk

Reviewer's report:

General

This article concerns an important topic for primary care: validation of an interview to assess the quality of care. I feel however that there are a number of pitfalls that have to be taken into consideration. First of all, the authors use the data of the medical record of the participating GP's to construct a golden standard. I don't believe this is convincing. Without explicitly defined criteria for the registration of the relevant data there is too much room for individual GP's to record data. The authors are not clear about this. Second, the number of the units of analysis is too small. Apart from this, it is confusing that the first four columns of table 1 contain 28 GP's and the last column contains 10 practices. Obviously the authors use two different units of analysis. Third, I am left with uncertainty about the content of the GPCCI. What are the response options? What items are used for the four distinguished dimensions and how are they distributed over the three different clinical conditions? The answers to these questions are important to enable further judgement of the soundness of the approach. Also, Cronbach's alpha alone is not sufficient to guarantee internal reliability in this study. Fourth, the authors do not provide a clear description of the different analyses they carried out to assess the reliability and validity.

Unfortunately, I cannot advise publication in BMC Family Practice. I believe that the authors don't have data of sufficient quality to carry out this validation study properly. The scope of this study does not go beyond a pilot study. Furthermore, I advise the authors to get informed about the tools for quality assessment as issued by the British and Dutch colleges of General Practitioners.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)