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Reviewer's report:

General

The authors have done a reasonably good job in responding to the previous reviews. The manuscript now reads more clearly and the value of the work is more obvious. However, a few points remain unresolved, as outlined below.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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)

1. Although the explanation has improved, there still is potential for the reader to be confused about how women were classified by language. On page 6 the language is described as the "preferred language," which implies women were asked what language they preferred. Yet on page 8 the text notes women were classified by their GP as English speaking or not, a description that is consistent with the tables. This may seem subtle, but it is likely that the situations where women stated a preferred language would have different results than when someone else categorizes women on their ability to speak English.

2. The cost information has been more fully integrated, but problems remain. Most importantly, there is little information in the Methods about how costs were obtained. In the Results on page 10 worse like "estimate" and "approximately" are used, implying that cost data were not explicitly captured and that this material is based on general perception rather than hard data. If this is true, then the material should be moved to the Discussion and the nature of the estimate clarified. The points made are interesting, as the authors note in their reply letter, but the material would be most appropriately presented as speculative or for comparison sake, rather than as hard Results per se. If there are hard data available, then a description of how it was collected should appear in the Methods and the description in the Results should be more definitive. The authors also might consider a brief mention of the costs in the Abstract (only if hard data available).
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. On page 10 key results about differences in reporting by questionnaire administration are provided in text. These do not appear in a table or figure, and might be missed by a reader skimming the work. The authors might consider adding a simple bar graph of these Results so appropriate attention is drawn to them.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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