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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have been responsive to the reviewers’ comments. The paper makes a contribution to the literature though the scope of the question asked is small.

I have a few residual issues they could address:

1. In Title, make it clear this is done in Austria. Would help reader.

2. Background is very hard to read. Breaking it up into paragraphs would help.

3. Sentence on lines 65-67 is confusing. I see a clear distinction between preventive health exams and cancer screening programs or immunization programs. the authors seem to be lumping them together. They should clarify.

4. My major concern/recommendation is that I don’t feel the piece in the current form fully addresses the question of whether it is good or bad that 40% of the Austrian population gets a preventive health examination every two years. I think the paragraph in the discussion (lines 324-335) was meant to address it, but I didn’t understand what they were saying in this paragraph. It might be helpful for the authors to more clearly delineate that there are different components of preventive health examinations and some are useful (immunizations), but others are not.
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