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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to editor comments

1. Headings:
   - "Introduction" please change this to "Background".
   - "Ethics" please change this to "Ethics approval and consent to participate".
   - "Consent to publish" please change this to "Consent for publication".
   - "Availability of data" please change this to "Availability of Data and Materials"

All headings have been changed as requested (see page 4, line 47; page 13, lines 234, 241, 246).

2. Ethics:

In the “Ethics approval and consent to participate” section of the Declarations please state whether you obtained the appropriate permissions from the Australian Bureau of Statistics to access this data.

The ethics statement has been updated to include the following (page 13, line 241-245):

‘All analyses of data were undertaken by registered users of NHS data through the University of Tasmania, with the approval of the ABS.’
3. Figure 1:

Please indicate on the x-axes of Figure 1 that "excellent" etc. categories refer to the self-rated health status.

Figure 1 has been modified as requested.

4. Authors’ Contributions:

We have noted that author Peter Dargaville is missing in the listed authors' contributions. The individual contributions of ALL authors to the manuscript should be specified in the Authors’ Contributions section.

We previously used the inclusive term ‘all authors’, which included Professor Peter Dargaville. To avoid any confusion, we have clarified this by referring to each individual author by their initials as outlined below (page 13, line 238-240):

‘Author contributions: AM, AN and FJ contributed to the conception and design of the study. AM, AN, PD and FJ were involved in drafting and revision of the manuscript, as well as interpretation of the data. AM, AN, PD and FJ read and approved the final manuscript.’

5. Funding:

In the Funding section, please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

The following sentence has been added to the Funding section of the manuscript (page 14, line 251-252):

‘Funding bodies had no role in study design, nor collection, analysis and interpretation of data, nor writing of the manuscript.’

6. Please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

A clean version of the manuscript has been uploaded as requested.