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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Abstracts:
It should be specified that the five 'other' practices are located in regions with higher SES.

Background:
Page 6:
Please specify what you mean by 'yield' (and that it is different from response rate and attendance rate).
Please state more explicitly if all (!) 'other' municipalities are located in higher SES regions. Also, please explain in more detail why you have chosen just one of these five municipalities for comparing the yield.

Methods:
Page 10: The same questions arise here that have already been mentioned above:
Please give more detailed information on SES of the five comparison municipalities, in the same way as you give the information on low SES of the described practice ("... 1.6 standard deviation below the Dutch average..."), i.e.:
How many standard deviations are these five comparison municipalities above (!) the Dutch average?
Why did you compare the 'yield' with just one of these five comparison municipalities, and why did you select this specific comparison municipality from the five?

Minor Essential Revisions

Background:
There is a small spelling error on page 5 ("... services en GP practices ...").

Table 1:
Please indicate (e.g. below the table) that 'Oude Pekela' is the low SES practice described here.
Discretionary Revisions

Methods:
Page 9: I would delete the subheading "Other data".

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.