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Reviewer’s report:

The revised manuscript has improved and addressed some points raised before. But I still have a few questions for the authors.

1. In Figure 1 of the supplement, what is k in the x-axis? And y-axis is proportion, but a proportion of what? The figure does not make sense to me. Also, the proposed negative binomial model still had a poor fit, indicating that the proposed model was a bad choice.

2. To answer my original comment 6 about the unit in the 4th paragraph of on page 5, the authors have changed the sentence to “Each percentage point increase in private expenditure on health increased…”. It seems to me that the private expenditure is a dollar amount (or log dollar amount), which was also confirmed in the Test 2 in the supplement. Why is it that the authors claimed it as “each percentage point” instead of as “each unit increase in log dollar amount”?

3. To answer my original comment 7, the authors claimed that 53 countries on the African continent was a small sample size to make some covariates statistically significant. Considering only five covariates were included in the final model, n=53 is NOT a small sample size at all. Moreover, the findings reported here were conflicting against the literature. Based on these facts, I have some suspicion on the validity of the findings in this manuscript.