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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions:

None; the authors adequately addressed the concerns raised in my review of the earlier manuscript.

Minor essential revisions:

1) The paper needs a thorough reading and copy-edit. The “authors’ contributions” section states that all of the authors read and approved the final manuscript. With 12 listed authors, I am amazed that all 12 missed simple things like misplaced punctuation, paragraphs that span multiple pages with disparate subjects, misspellings, and revised sentences with extraneous and nonsensical phrasing left behind. The authors also failed to include page numbers, which makes it hard for reviewers to point to edits. Here are a few examples of edits that need to be made (some of which are more discretionary than others):

a. In the fifth paragraph under the “Methods” heading, the sentence beginning with “Models for with each target disease…” needs editing (I assume the “for” is extraneous).

b. In the sixth paragraph under the “Methods” heading, there is an “and)” where the ) seems to be extraneous.

c. In the first paragraph under the “Results” heading, the 4887 should have a comma to be consistent with the format of the other numbers in that sentence.

d. The second paragraph under the “Results” heading starts with “Overall, awareness, treatment and control varied…” I do not know how a person’s “overall” varies. Yes, I know that overall is being used a transition word here, but its use within this sentence structure is awkward and not necessary.

e. Later in that same paragraph, “HPSA residents did have significantly” could simply be “HPSA residents had significantly.”

f. The third paragraph under the “Discussion” heading (starting with “Among the uninsured only”) is very long and contains at least three distinct sections. To improve readability, I would start new paragraphs following the citation to reference #8 and the citation to references 36&37.

g. In that same paragraph, there is a misplaced comma before the verb in the sentence, “However, our seemingly paradoxical findings, could be explained…it
Delete the comma after findings.

h. In the fifth paragraph under the “Discussion” heading, “providers are guideline adherent” might read better as “providers adhere to guidelines.” If left as is, I would add a hyphen to make it “providers are guideline-adherent.”

i. A sentence in the sixth paragraph under the “Discussion” heading says, “Uninsured patients residing in HPSAs are also more likely were less healthy than uninsured non-HPSA residents…” This phrasing is nonsensical.

j. The seventh paragraph under the “Discussion” heading starts with “This study is not without limitations.” Double negatives are confusing to readers. I would revise to “This study has a few limitations.”

k. At the end of that same paragraph there is an “our” that should be an “or.”

l. The very last sentence of the paper contains another misplaced comma between a subject and verb. The phrase “…policymakers should, consider other…” does not need a comma.

This list of comments is long but not exhaustive. I highly recommend that a strong copy-editor review this manuscript prior to publication with an eye toward improving readability.

Discretionary revisions:

None, except as noted above.

**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, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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