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Reviewer's report:

The revised document is a much clearer document and addresses my earlier concerns. I recommend to the editor that the paper is now acceptable for publication with the following minor caveats.

a. The conclusions must be guarded about not proving potential benefits of mediators to populations other than those targeted in this study.

b. An additional short sentence about the Hungary Swiss partnership would be useful and could perhaps be added on page 3 line 9

c. The discussion could also benefit from a brief description of why and how the changes from single handed practice to multi-disciplinary larger practices came about and whether this system change led to improved health care for the study population and a comment about the affordability and sustainability of the large number of contact hours by the mediators.

d. Quotation mark style needs changing to usual English (page 2 line 42 and page 3 line 12)
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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