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Reviewer's report:

General

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

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)

Table 1a and b: Meaning of the column title Births (% of metro) is not clear since this does not total 100 but 94.5. The same for Births (% of rural)--it totals 98.

Table : As requested previous, what is the dollar amount for each 0.01 increase in graded household income. Adding the **footnote does not make this clearer and I would suggest replacing this phrase with a statement "Each 0.01 increase in household income reflects an additional Axx dollar increase." If you choose to ignore this request, then I would recommend deleting the current footnote since it adds little.

Figure 1 and 2 y-axis label should be "percent of uptake..."; Similarly the title is "Percent uptake..." Additionally, there is no need for the 1 digit decimal for the y-axis. Whole numbers are sufficient. X-axis could have the labels for each 0.1 increase since there is plenty of space. Add 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 and 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9.

Results

Page 9, 2nd paragraph "Most point estimates were significantly different from state averages and there was ...

Since the authors repeatedly state that they were unable to perform statistical testing of significance and were unable to provide confidence intervals of their results, it would be better to slightly change this sentence to say "most point estimates differed from state averages and there were no ..."

In the next sentence "The level of prenatal diagnosis in younger women reflects uptake of prenatal screening...." seems to be an over interpretation of the available data. Suggested change would be "the level of prenatal diagnosis in younger women MAY reflect uptake of prenatal..."

Finally, next paragraph, first sentence needs a period. "...modelled live birth ratio of DS.

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: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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