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Reviewer’s report:
I reviewed the second version of the article now titled POTENTIAL FOR PATIENT-PHYSICIAN LANGUAGE DISCORDANCE IN ONTARIO. I was able to see significant improvement. My worries have been dealt with adequately. The message of the article is less ambitious, less “grand”, and more modest, as well as clearer. It is an interesting “modelling exercise” based on which other research and interventions can be built on.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Minor Essential Revisions

P 5 a ref is missing. There is (25), probably a trace of the ref.
P 6 Bivariate choropleth, there is still no definition.
P 11, an intermediate solution might be to increase the availability of interpretation. Drop intermediate or explain why it is “intermediate”.

Discretionary Revisions

Title: Potential.... Better title than the old one, but still: aren’t we dealing rather with challenges instead of potentials?

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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