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Dear Editor
Thank you for your favourable review on our revised version of this paper. In terms of the comments from the two reviewers regarding the revised paper, we have responded as follows:

Reviewer 1 : Krit Pongpirul
We have made the change to the typo on page 19, changing ‘to’ to ‘too’ as requested.

Reviewer two: Marie Josie-Fleury

Background:
We have changed the section referred to on page 4, the 90% was an error and we have removed this.

Methods:
We have added on page 5 the information requested that the primary care doctor can be any type of doctor

P.6: the linked research project by Lam et al has been submitted for publication but is not yet accepted, nor is there a research report available in the public domain. However, we have inserted a web-link to the project title and the reader could then easily contact Professor Lam is do desired.

Information on the years of the study has been inserted on page 6 under ‘Recruitment/Interviews’. The information about the time allocation has been deleted as requested.

Regarding the principal themes generated we feel this is already described in the results section, which would seem to us to be the appropriate place.

We do not agree that table 1 is not a standard table. For qualitative research, such a table – documenting the characteristics of each participant – is in our combined experience completely standard. We already synthesise the key information in the way suggested (number and percentage) in the text of the results which we did in response to the reviewers previous comments.

Results:
P12. We feel we already explain this point clearly in the results section, from page 11-13, and in the middle paragraph on p. 23 of the discussion section.

We do not understand how the barriers to private and public healthcare ‘should be better presented’ without the reviewer making specific suggestions. On re-reading this section of the manuscript (p.11 and 12) we do find it at all confusing.

Strengths and limitations:
We have removed the paragraphs suggested.