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Major compulsory revisions:
None

Minor Essential Revisions:

I congratulate the authors this paper is very much easier to read. I hope my comments below will also prove helpful.

I feel a bit more needs to be done to improve the readability of the paper. The abstract is a good case in point. There are some grammatical errors here and elsewhere and I would recommend that the paper is thoroughly reviewed by an English speaking proof reader. The methods section in particular could be improved. May I suggest that you include / substitute the following sentences: 'We selected the top 3% and 10% of FAs by dividing the genders into four different age group clusters ranging from just two to as many as six. We compared the sensitivity and specificity of the selection criteria in each of these four cluster groups.'

It is still not clear from the evidence presented in the background that identification of frequent attenders has ever resulted in clinically meaningful improvements in care. However I accept the evidence that frequent attenders are a more distressed / diseased cohort of patient. Perhaps with these tighter definitions and improved selection of patients we will witness better results in future research. It is pleasing to see the essence of Dutch Health care described briefly. I accept that more detail is unwarranted in the paper.

The discussion is now much tighter and reads well.

Discretionary Revisions:

Overall the paper is now better but would benefit from a review of grammar.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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