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Reviewer's report:

GENERAL COMMENT

I found this revision rather disappointing and very little has changed from the original submission. The methods section is still lacking detail and clarity, whilst the presentation of the results could be improved: I think there are too many unnecessary tables. Once these areas are further improved, there is no problem with publication.

The following numbers refer to my original review comments (Referee 3). They are all minor, but essential, except for the last one - which is more important.

Pt 1. The manuscript still needs to be carefully checked for spelling and grammatical errors.

Pts 2 & 3. I would suggest that details of the power calculation and the method of phone number selection are outlined in the main text. If necessary, refer to Shi et al and the findings on which the calculation is based. How many phone numbers were selected originally, as 1,524 were contacted in order to obtain the final sample of 1,000?

Pts 4 & 6. Whilst information on where patients accessed their care was not obtained, the authors should still be aware that the data is potentially hierarchical. As such, model standard errors may be underestimated, leading to associations which appear significant (although the true association is not). Even though the authors cannot account for this, the sample is stratified (by region) and this can be accounted for.

Pt 5. The sensitivity analysis for the regression models was not the one that I alluded to – which was ordered logistic regression. The authors used binary logistic regression and the results may be necessarily influenced by the choice of ‘cut-off’. There is no need to present the sensitivity analysis; simply comment if it gives a different conclusion. Table 3 does not show the results of the Mann-Whitney test, as it gives means. The Community Orientation domain has a maximum value of 10.5: how is this?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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