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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for resubmitting this paper. The revisions have substantially improved the paper. I have highlighted a few relatively minor points below. If these are attended to, I think it is now suitable for publication.

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

None

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. Quantitative data collection and analysis, paragraph 2: You say that postcodes were collected for all women enrolled on the scheme, but in the Discussion at the end of paragraph 2, you say that indices of deprivation were not collected. This inconsistency needs to be corrected.

2. Discussion, paragraph 4: Future studies have been suggested, however, I don’t think the point I made previously in 4.1 has been addressed. I’m still left wondering about the views of the women who enrolled on the scheme but dropped out before the end. Surely their voices are of great interest – do you not want to know what they thought of the scheme? It’s not just about their reasons for stopping, but their experiences of stopping in the context of being part of the scheme. Was the scheme part of the reason they stopped? Was it harder for them to stop given the extra contact being received? Or did they receive appropriate support with their decision? I’m not suggesting that all these questions need answered in this paper, but I think this is an important aspect missing from this paper that has not been acknowledged.

3. Discussion, paragraph 5: The sentence starting ‘Whilst insights into….’ does not make sense. (and repeats a ‘whilst’ from the preceding sentence)

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

None

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

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