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Reviewer's report:

Nice work! This revision shows substantial improvements and responsiveness to the peer reviews. Here are a few final compulsory comments, which I hope you will agree will strengthen the manuscript.

1. Move the "Sample" section to the front of the methods, and separate the psychometric section from the "Survey" section.

2. Comment in the discussion on why there are so many refusals to the survey (just 1 in 7 agreed) and how this affects generalizability.

3. Please indicate the # of exclusions because the respondent was not referred for chronic disease management.

4. In response to point 2.4, you provide excellent detail on the scripts used to include patients. Please summarize in the narrative.

5. The new Table 1 is really results, not methods, and I would urge you to move it there. This Table could be an Appendix.

6. I remain a bit confused about to whom this study is generalizable. I do not think you have supported national representation. Perhaps we can say that the sample is a "national sample" drawn from the NRC client base. That would allay my concerns.

7. Tables 3a and 3b are improved.

8. In discussion, please comment on the limitations you have in your trust measure. It is just one item versus other trust measures that are scales that represent multiple dimensions of trust.

9. (Discretionary) The trust regression could be rerun entering income with a dummy for missing. That way you get the benefit of the covariate without losing any observations.

10. The regression model needs effect sizes. I would suggest a Table that shows the beta/odds ratios and the p-values.

11. Are the scale scores item-level means? Please clarify.

12. I found the abbreviations for the scales to be confusing. As a discretionary
change, I would consider adding a short label to each one to help clarify what they are for the reader.
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