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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major essential revisions**

1. The paper does not define what it means by primary health care and given that PHC is based on the social model of health, it does seem that the paper is actually about primary care episodes. The concept of PHC is also more multidisciplinary and comprehensive than the parameters of the review indicate.

2. The study seems to be confined to general practice - is that correct? If no studies found or sought from the community or women's health sector, this should be acknowledged. If this is a limitation (ie that the studies reviewed are general practice based), the recommendation about outreach needs to be grounded in context. Is this recommendation based on more than one study? and if so, in what country were they located? Were the outreach studies dependent on particular funding models?

3. There is an assumption behind the statement in the second recommendation that needs to be unpacked and clarified, which is that improved availability and acceptability of services encourages stronger engagement with the community. What is the evidence found in the study to support that statement? Recommendations need to be clearly grounded in the strength of evidence found by the review.

4. The background indicates that system level and practice level factors are involved with access. The conclusions and recommendations seem to be focused on practice (as in general practice?) change, failing to address system level issues. It is important in the Australian context, to understand the access provided to primary care outside general practice - ie the community health sector. Did the study seek studies on the referral relationship between general practice and community health in for example, CDM?

**Minor essential revisions**

5. p5 'this indicators'...del 's

6. p 7 - of the 121 intervention studies' across the three domains:' As written, suggests that all the studies were across all three domains but I think you mean that the 121 studies were from one (or more) of the three domains. Please clarify

7. Advanced access - define for international audience
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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