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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this revised version of your manuscript. In general, the content is much improved. In particular you have provided additional detail about the study limitations, about the context to the research, and with regards to methods. I have some minor issues that could still be resolved, detailed as below:

* The statement re need to perform analyses of each contact type separately seems misplaced in the 'data collection' section - suggest move to statistical analyses (p6, lines 81-82)

* Whilst in general, you have improved the presentation of the paper and addressed various inconsistencies, I still find the analyses to be confusing (p9, lines 151-169). Whilst I suspect it is mostly an issue of wording as opposed to content, I would suggest that a) the methods are further reviewed by an expert in statistical methods; and that b) authors revisit this section in due course to simplify/clarify the text as much as possible.

* Linked to the above point, I still have reservations about the dichotomisation of data for the purposes of logistical regression. However I am not an expert in quantitative methods and if the editor and / or other more qualified reviewers are happy this is appropriate, I think this is now explained reasonably clearly.

* Describing the low response rate from parents with young children as 'difficult to explain' is not really adequate (p14, lines 238-239). The authors reasoning as to why this might be appears sound but it would significantly strengthen this section if they were able to back up this observation with examples of relevant previous research.

* Finally, whilst I think I understand the point the authors are making in terms of the likelihood that low response rates in healthier/older groups are related to dissatisfaction in OOH, however as above, I found this section confusing. Please revisit and reword (p14, lines 244-248).
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