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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to Editor Comments:

Thank you for responding fully to the review comments. There are a couple of issues that are outstanding and I would like these to be attended to prior to acceptance for publication.

• Below is a description of the changes made. We have not highlighted them in the manuscript, but explained where the changes are done.

1. Please say when the data were collected. It is not necessarily a limitation. Rather, it would be good for readers to know how recent data collection was.

• Page 4 Line 3. This is (and was) stated: The data collection took place between September 2013 and February 2014.

2. Response 2 to the question about what happened to the service after the study is not clear. Please clarify/rewrite.

• The question was: Also, it would be interesting to know what has happened to the service since you conducted your study/do you plan a follow up to see how the service is operating? Whether participant views were realised?

• Our intention was to answer the first part of the question by saying that what happened to service after the study was not part of this study and therefore not something to be included in the manuscript.
Then we wanted to give you as editor some information about what have happened since you asked, and we see now that it was very unclear. The service opened in the autumn 2015. There were some newspaper writings on difficulties on getting through on the telephone in busy periods (typically some weekends). This was said to be due to low staffing, which was corrected. There have also been some public complaints over having to call to get an appointment. The status now is that the generic call-centre is operating without any particular problems.

3. Including an interview guide/topic guide is pretty standard. I appreciate, because you wish to publish further from this data set, that you may not want to share your entire interview guide. Please do share what you can either in the form of precise questions you asked (that have been analysed and reported in this manuscript) or a list of topics. I suggest this can be added as a table and you can refrain from the lengthier description of the topics you explored in your main text.

4. You mention 'changes during the process' as a second reason to not include your interview guide. Can you clarify what you mean by this please.

That the wording and emphasis of specific questions in the guide were adjusted to ensure that we got rich data on the topics that needed elaboration. This is stated in the legend to Table 1

p6 L4: change 'topics was...' to 'topics were...'

Deleted due to adding a table with interview guide

p6 L17: 'and discussing' should be 'and discussed'

Page 6 line 7: corrected

P9 - why is the 'very important' in capitalisation?

Page 9 line 17: It was to show that it was said with strong emphasis. The capitalization is now removed and replaced with this information in square brackets.