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Reviewer's report:

The authors have responded adequately to most of the points made in my previous review.

There are however two items that did not seem to have been adequately responded to. I have used the numbering in my original review and the authors response:

5. The authors agree that Pearson's exact tests or correlation coefficient are inappropriate because of clustering. However the tests continue to be cited in the paper and I could not find where they made it "explicit" in the revised paper.

7. The authors state that the survey that asked who motivated them to attend the health assessments had a response rate of 80%. This is the response rate for the health assessment, so presumably the survey was conducted by the GP at the time of the health assessment. If so this should be made clear and discussed as there may have been bias. Also were other questions asked in the health assessment? Ideally the full assessment/survey should be provided as an appendix.

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.

Yes

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