Reviewer’s report

Title: Predicting patient use of general practice services in Australia: Models developed using national cross-sectional survey data.

Version: 0 Date: 03 Nov 2018

Reviewer: Dimity Pond

Reviewer's report:

This is a very interesting manuscript on predictors of GP use, of particular relevance given the current funding environment in which healthcare homes are being explored, as the manuscript explains.

Some comments:

The Government funded healthcare homes trial is now further advanced, and indeed some of the possible outcomes flagged in this paper appear to have come to pass (in particular, poor enrolment, although the reasons are not yet clear). Should the authors be asked to update their comments on these issues? This is probably an editorial decision.

A number of diagnoses were considered, and in fact none specifically remained in the final model. GPs have repeatedly been found to miss some diagnoses (eg dementia), and confuse others (eg COPD and asthma). The authors have a great deal of experience with this dataset. Could they comment on whether this might have affected the final model (in the absence of gold standard diagnostic testing) eg might specific diseases have been more likely to have contributed statistically to visits if more accurately recorded.

I note that the authors have appropriately commented on issues around uncertainty of number of GP visits, and flagged future work in this area. They have also drawn attention to the fact that number of visits related to rural and indigenous status might be low because of poor GP accessibility. Do the authors have access to any data which might quantify this shortfall?

I look forward to reading a subsequent article about complexity of care and GP visits.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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