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Reviewer’s report:

General
The manuscript is much improved. There remain some problems.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Response to reviewer 2, comment 1b.
The authors’ statement that there is no literature on representation is not correct. For example, the following review included several studies in elderly population:
The following are some older publications not restricted to the elderly – the authors should easily be able to find more recent studies:

Response to reviewer 2, comment 2c:
There appears to be a discrepancy between the reporting of reliability in the previous paper, where you stated that 80% of the data on homelessness were re-abstracted, and this version, that refers to the reabstraction of only 20 cases. Please explain.

Response to reviewer 2, comment 3a:
Your response is not adequate. As currently presented, it is not possible to disentangle the roles of age and pensioner status. One way to do this is to create a composite variable with the following categories:
Pensioner, age 65+
Pensioner, age <65
Non-pensioner, age 55-64
Non-pensioner, age 45-54
Non-pensioner, age 25-44
Non-pensioner, age <25
Other age groups could be used of course for the non-pensioners.

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

Other: Tables 1 and 2 should be re-formatted in the standard way, so that the numbers and %s in each category are arranged in columns.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Response to reviewer 2, comment 2a: the significant interactions should be described, even if they did not improve model fit.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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