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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I commend the authors on a well-conducted study and a very clear and succinct paper that was a pleasure to review.

I have only minor comments that may polish an otherwise sound paper.

1. Check the tense throughout as there are some switches from past to present and back (eg in the statistics section).

2. On line 157, there is mention of an association between willingness to pay and holding private health insurance but no detail on the nature/direction of the association. This is elaborated in the discussion (line 249) but it would be clearer if it was here.

3. The formatting of statistics reported in lines 193-197 is a bit inconsistent - some includes the test and p-value, others values and p-value.

4. I think the conclusion could be a little broader in scope. The discussion and implications sections are quite well written, so I would expect the conclusion to bring together the findings and implications into a statement on usefulness of after hours primary care models in Australia and perhaps globally.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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