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Reviewer's report:

This reviewer again commends the authors on the admirable goal to promote DR screening. Thank you for the extensive revisions. I still have these reservations:

1. I don't think the word "uptake" is generally understood across the broad scientific community. But it is used frequently in the first part of the manuscript. They need to define "uptake" early in the article. I'm guessing this means "read and understand," I don't think many people outside the behavioral community would understand this term.

2. A second worry is that this is a long paper with mostly negative results. They could not verify the primary goal that their leaflet would increase engagement. The leaflet did increase knowledge of DR. If the clinical reviewers believe this is a significant finding for the profession, then please disregard my comment.

3. A minor point is that the authors state in their Methods that p &lt;0.05 was considered significantly significant, yet table 2 shows 0.01 and 0.001. To me a single (*) is sufficient.

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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