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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors were very thoughtful in their revisions and the manuscript is much clearer.

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

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The rationale for how HRQL can be considered a need-related factor is not clear--more explanation that the indicator for HRQL is the SF36 which includes a number of subjective factors that are very health-related and thus consistent with the Andersen model. HRQL is conceptualized in so many ways that explaining this very clearly may resolve any questions about how the authors conceptualized HRQL.

Even without testing the model, an earlier reference to the Andersen model as the underlying conceptual framework would be helpful for readers who are theoretically grounded.

Page 8 and 9 would be stronger with a reference to how the chronic diseases in the study were selected.

The last sentence on page 12 should read "..suggesting that, given equal need, women make less use of hospital services."

Page 13, second paragraph, the word synthetic implies artificial versus a synthesis, which is what is inferred.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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: No
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